

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XXII, No. 2. FEBRUARY 1942

THE FREE-DISCIPLINE MOVEMENT IN RETROSPECT

I

FUTURE historians will have little difficulty in characterizing the kind of child-training associated with the second round of the Great War. Behind the armies of the great aggressors stand ranks of youths and children trained in a hero-worship of the Leader of the State or Party. The physical, mental and even spiritual formation of these children has been as far as possible monopolized by the State. In that formation unquestioning obedience has the first place and is exercised chiefly in unceasing labour for the military glory of the State. So close, indeed, is the association between these national youth movements and Nazi-Fascist political system that, when the government of defeated France announced a project for the training of the whole youth of the nation, the bulk of the press in England saw in the action another spiritual surrender to the conqueror.

All this is commonplace. What is less generally realized is that the years during which the first round of the Great War was fought were also identified to a large extent with a strongly marked trend in educational theory and practice, manifested (in this case) not so much on the Continent as in England and the U.S.A. Those years and the years round about them were the experimental period during which most of the ideas of "free-discipline" and self-government in schools and reformatories that flourished during the period of the truce were tried out.

Shortly before the war began the George Junior Republic had been founded in the United States as a self-governing community for young criminals. Its ideas in a more sophisticated form were imported into England by Homer Lane, himself an American, and put into practice under his direction during the war years in The Little Commonwealth in Dorset. A somewhat similar community was started in Leicestershire in the same period and supplied with young delinquents from Clarke Hall's Court for juveniles at Old Street.

In the more strictly educational sphere, the Montessori method was making its way in this country and, though its underlying philosophy was very different from that of most of the free-disciplinarians, its introduction into this country must count as part of their movement in view of the interpretation commonly put upon it here. In the same years A. S. Neil's *A Dominie's Log* and *A Dominie Dismissed* prepared the way for his own and other self-governing and so-called "crank" schools that sprang up in the years that followed. From the educational bureaucracy itself there came the first of a series of books by Edmund Holmes, a Board of Education inspector, reinforcing the leading contentions of the movement. Indeed, numbers of well-established educational institutions, without wholly abandoning their ancient ways, modified considerably their discipline and instructional methods under the pressure of opinion generated by the immensely successful propaganda of those years.

Educational experts will be able to amplify and give precision to these personal recollections of a movement in which I took a very inexperienced part. I have no access, where I am writing, to the exact dates, which are of no consequence in the present context. All that I have tried to do up to this point is to bring out the contrast between the kind of ideas about child-training that were gaining the upper hand in the years 1914 to 1918 and those that have so conspicuously gained ground with the coming and outbreak of the present war. The sequence is one that provokes thought and it is the purpose of this article to analyze some of the ideas of the free-disciplinarians with a view to throwing light upon it.

II

At the root of the movement for free-discipline and self-government for children in schools and reformatories lay the notion that the child has a way of life of his own which must be given free scope and not be over-ridden by adult standards and ways of living. It is a notion that, as stated thus in general terms, is essentially true and needs to be constantly recalled by every adult placed in charge of children, whether as parent or as teacher. It was given a specially keen edge when propagated in England during the last war by the still vivid memory of the rigidity with which the Victorian educationalist, both in fact and in fiction, had enclosed the youth of the country in the strait-jacket of Victorian adult manners.

Furthermore, the notion has a never-ceasing urgency for the reason that a child, if he is prevented from enjoying his own way of life as a child, can never recapture it at a later stage except as a pathological or criminal aberration (unless, maybe, he attains to it on the supernatural plane as a great saint). It is true, also, that quite a number of children have been turned into criminals by not being allowed to be properly children at the the right time.

More than that, children when allowed to live naturally are often more sensitive than many of their elders to fine standards of honour and justice, and more ready to apply those standards to their conduct in preference to mere conventions. They often administer justice among themselves more understandingly and acceptably than it is administered by many adults; and a character formed by applying right standards to one's own conduct in youth will be sounder and more enduring than one formed by any merely external control by grown-ups.

It may seem at first sight that if we are to go as far as this with the free-disciplinarian's we shall have to go a great deal farther and shall find ourselves, whether we like it or not, endorsing their most extravagant experiments in children's self-government and the like. But this is not so. The free-disciplinarian does not err in demanding for the child the right to live his own life. He errs enormously in his conception of what that life really is. He, far more than the traditionalist, is guilty of the offence of trying to force upon the child the life of an adult. The "old-fashioned" parents and teachers often erred in making the child conform externally to adult manners too soon, but the free-disciplinarian tries to make him an adult all at once in his innermost being. For it is wholly

natural for a child to live under an adult régime, and it is treating him essentially as an adult to force him to construct a régime of his own.

The child's need to be under adult control if he is to be fully a child is, indeed, fundamental to his nature. It is much more so than his need of the physical sustenance and protection that adults alone can give him or of instruction by adults in the elements of knowledge, important though these things are. It is above all a spiritual need, as fundamental as any that the free-disciplinarians have in mind when they want to make the child fully a child by emancipating him from adult control.

It is a need with both a negative and a positive aspect, which can be to some extent considered separately. The child needs adult control in order that the spiritual burdens of adultism should not fall upon him prematurely, and he needs the controlling adult as the object of deep-seated emotions and basic acts of will on which the development of his character largely depends. The attitude of the free-disciplinarians towards adult control deprived children both of a necessary shelter and of a necessary outlet.

III

The ruthlessness with which some of the pioneers of free-discipline and children's self-government deprived the children in their charge of their natural protection of adult experience and authority can scarcely be exaggerated. They let loose upon them moral and emotional problems and situations that would have been agonizing even to adults. As one of the experimenters of that time I can speak with first-hand knowledge (and lasting regret) of the terrible spiritual ordeals to which the immature minds and emotions of adolescents were subjected when the accustomed adult barriers to indulgence in whims and passions were removed. The merely external damage done by outbreaks of violence, laziness and so forth was the least part of the hurt. What really mattered were the interior stresses experienced by the children, and these were such as no normal parents would inflict upon their own offspring, but would do all in their power to avert by checking the outbreaks before they reached their height.

For the scars left on the growing boy or girl by such soul-shaking experiences are borne for life, outlasting repentance. Nor did the reversals of feeling with which the outbursts sometimes ended deserve the name of repentance. Not having for their starting point any enforcement of the moral law they could not amount to more than an emotional reaction imposing yet a further strain upon the boy or girl. And it must be remembered that there are many wounds and strains that adults can take, and be the stronger for taking, that are simply shattering to young people.

As if all this were not enough, the free-disciplinarians added to the confusion by grave errors concerning the moral law itself. Some denied outright that the acceptance of a universal law of conduct was necessary to the enjoyment of spiritual freedom. Those who did admit that liberty must have at least some sort of fixed principles for its fulcrum were apt to regard each child as his own law-maker. They thought of him as revealing in the process of his own flowering a law of personal development peculiar to himself. They were impatient with the melancholy truth that, in fallen

beings at least, an explicit knowledge of the moral laws of human action cannot be acquired without instruction, and the habit of practising them can only be acquired with labour and sorrow. The maximum rôle that these experimenters were prepared to allow to adults was that of observer, stimulator and reluctant and sparing giver of advice when asked. The teaching of the moral law by punishment was ruled out altogether.

In other words, the child was required to find for himself within himself such fixed principles as might be necessary for raising himself to the level of moral freedom. It followed that the period of moral anarchy that followed release from adult control was to be regarded as anarchical, not merely in the sense that the emancipated children rebelled against all law while working off the perversities implanted (it was supposed) by the previous restraint, but anarchical also in the sense that no law as yet existed for them. It was to be a fruitful period of exploration during which each child discovered by a process of trial and error the true laws of his own personality. Despite appearances the experimenter must hold to his faith in the ultimate acquisition of spiritual equilibrium by the children provided they continued to be let alone. The eighteenth-century belief in the perfectibility of human nature once released from its present fetters was revived by these reformers in a new setting.

IV

There were, it is true, advocates of free discipline who preferred not to let the anarchy work itself out to the limit and contended that by skilled but unobtrusive management the children could be got to pull themselves up after a short spell of letting off steam and then solve their spiritual problems by reason and discussion. Certainly the dexterous management of Homer Lane (and, perhaps even more, the equally dexterous but very different management of Mrs. Lane, behind the scenes) did marvels in keeping the boys and girls of the Little Commonwealth within a comparatively narrow range of licence for the most part. Indeed, the community lasted as long as it did largely because a great deal of the liberty and self-government enjoyed by the children was fictitious or belonged only to the show side of the life there. But it is arguable, to say the least, that to resort constantly to psychological dexterity to secure that boys and girls keep their behaviour within presentable limits and at the same time to keep up the claim that all is left to the children is a device likely to deceive its adult perpetrator rather than children, who are usually clear-sighted in such matters; and the effect of the pretence upon the children can hardly be wholesome.

However that may be, the essential point remains that in attempting, whether by management or through anarchy, to get children to shoulder and solve their own moral problems, the free-disciplinarian is asking of them more than adolescent nature is able to bear. Granted that it is better that boys and girls should be brought to consider moral issues than that they should rush headlong and without consideration into the indulgence of whim or passion, it is by no means always better for them to have to solve the problem than to have the solution presented to them. Ready-

made solutions of moral problems are an easy object for ridicule, but, in actual practice, not only children but also most adults find it quite hard enough to follow ready-made solutions without having the difficulties of conduct aggravated by having first to decide for themselves what course is right. Indeed, only one whose character is already well formed and well set can hope to decide such problems objectively when he knows that he will have to act upon his own solution. And even if it were possible to find a child capable of the feat, it would be too much to expect him to accomplish it and still remain a natural child.

For boys and girls, as they put out by fits and starts (as is their way) the first shoots of their developing faculties, need a framework for their spiritual growth if they are to grow well and truly according to the pattern of their nature in mind and soul as well as in body. The moral law is the behaviour-pattern of the soul, just as physiological laws and the bodily instincts are the behaviour pattern for the body, and neither in body nor in soul will the child follow his behaviour-pattern without some external guidance. The parents must regulate diet, temperature and the like for the one, and the mental and moral environment of the other.

Furthermore the soul (unlike the body) does not automatically follow its behaviour-pattern even when the right external conditions are provided and it is itself free from disease. It follows it by knowing it and choosing to conform to it. In an unfallen world the child would doubtless acquire a knowledge of the pattern readily enough, but would still be liable to disobey it. In the world as it is, even the child's aptitude for learning the law is diminished, so that even instruction in the law has to be given "against the grain". His will to obey the law when it is known is, as we know, weakened by inherited infirmities in his nature. Finally, every act of disobedience, unless reversed by genuine repentance, has the effect of still further distorting that mirror of the law which we call the conscience.

For these reasons, all of which are commonplaces for Catholics and any of which might be developed to fill a volume, an external and objective presentation of the moral law is as much a necessity for a growing child as a spinal jacket for a tubercular spine or a trellis-work for a pergola. Punishment also has its place in bringing home to the child the boundaries of his spiritual behaviour-pattern just as the pain caused by bodily accidents or disease brings home to him the boundaries of the physiological behaviour-pattern. These things are necessary until at least the main lines of character are formed and set. To deprive a child of them is to treat him as a well-trained adult and subject him to storms and strains that will make crooked spiritual growth almost a certainty.

V

Here, then, is one sense, and a very important one, in which it is true that a child cannot be freely and truly a child unless he is under adult control. The other and less generally realized sense is not less important. The child needs adult control, not only as a protection against premature adulthood, but also for the development of positive child-qualities. In the absence of controlling adults as their objects, some of his most central

emotions and volitions must atrophy for lack of exercise or grow up perverted by diversion to abnormal objects.

It is, of course, true of adults also and (for matter of that) of all living beings that they depend on the existence of certain other beings as the objects of their emotions and actions. They all need, for example, the company of their own kind. The relationship in question here, however, is one of those special relationships that exist in most communities between individuals or classes that are not like each other but complementary to each other. Neither party to these relationships can complete his own behaviour-pattern except in conjunction with the other party and by responding to needs or powers in the other that he does not possess himself. It is the relationship, not of one telegraph post with the next in the row, but of the lock with the key, of the melted metal with the mould.

The classical instances of such relationships are found in the communities of the insect world. The members of these are specialized for their various functions, not by training, but by physical differences as great as those which differentiate species and by corresponding differences of instinctive behaviour. Consequently (to take an example) no complete bee community could be formed, and no complete bee life could be lived, by bees all of one type—all drones, or all workers, or all queens. Each type, in order to fulfil its own behaviour-pattern, must dovetail that pattern into those of all the other types. The same is true, all through the organic world, of the relationship between the sexes; and (to return to what immediately concerns us here) a child, while he is a child, is as specialized, physically and emotionally, in relation to adults as any member of a bee community in relation to the rest of the hive. He is specialized also, though less obviously, in his mental and spiritual type.

This truth has been unconsciously or half-consciously taken for granted for the greater part of human history. The necessity for emphasizing it now arises from the determined effort of the free-disciplinarians to represent the child as more truly a child if left wholly with other children. The opposite to this thesis would be nearer the truth. It is sufficient for a child, in order to grow perfectly as a child, that he should be a member of a trio, with his father and mother as the two other members. The companionship of other children is undoubtedly of immense importance, perhaps essential, to his ultimate development. The child needs free intercourse on terms of equality with his fellows as a preparation for living as a man, or a woman, amongst men and women. It is less certain that he needs it in order to be perfectly a child while a child.

There is, indeed, an ambiguity in the language of the free-disciplinarians from which both their theory and their practice have suffered. When we speak of a child attaining his full development we may be thinking of the full and perfect functioning of all the powers he should possess at the moment, in the manner and the degree appropriate to the moment, or we may be thinking of the consummation of the child's growth in adulthood. The free-disciplinarians spoke of the child's full development chiefly in the former sense; indeed, they commonly alluded to adulthood as a disease. When, however, they came to translating their ideas into practice they were prone to encourage, for the child's development, just those activities in which he is least characteristically a child and most palpably rehearsing

to be an adult. The children's Court of Justice in *The Little Commonwealth* is a case in point.

It is true, of course, even of those activities in which the child is most wholly childlike and dependent upon adults, that their manifestation is part of the preparation for adult life ; for, as the free-disciplinarians rightly insisted, the child will only become a complete adult if he has been a complete child at each stage of his life as a child. But there is a deep difference between direct preparation for adult life in situations resembling those of adult life and indirect preparation by the perfect development of the relation of the child to the adult in situations peculiar to childhood. And it is the latter preparation that is the more profound, and the more truly consistent with the free-disciplinarian's central doctrine.

VI

We have arrived, then, at the conception of the child as naturally oriented, as it were, towards the adult and only capable of being perfectly a child if this orientation predominates, in his spiritual as well as in his physical environment, over his orientation towards other children. The most obvious illustration of this conception is provided by the child's virtue of obedience. Children give simple and unquestioning obedience only to adults, and simple and unquestioning obedience is not only an essential condition of their learning the moral law but also an integral part of their natural character.

The child's deep trust in adults and his readiness, indeed eagerness, to learn from them, are equally part of his natural character as a child. One who has never practised these virtues has never been truly a child and will, therefore, never be a complete adult. It is true that when he has actually come to be an adult he may have to command more often than to obey, in his or her own home if nowhere else. It is true that the adult must learn to be self-sufficient in a way neither necessary nor wholesome for the child, and also to sift and appraise what he is told, lest trustfulness should become credulity, and docility an irrational subservience to mere opinion. But if these adult capacities are developed prematurely in childhood, if their emergence is not preceded by a long undisturbed spell when childlike obedience and trustfulness flourished and were not betrayed, then they will grow up warped, and quickly degenerate into cynicism.

Furthermore, the distinctive virtues of childhood have work to do even in adult life. However little scope there may be in the disillusioning and deceiving world of fellow adults for the active exercise of simple obedience, trustfulness and teachability, the past practice of these virtues and a present capacity for them serve to balance and sweeten the more discriminating faculties of maturity. More than this, they ought to be unceasingly active in the adult's relations to his Maker.

For the child's attitude towards his earthly father should be the pattern and the groundwork of the adult's attitude towards his heavenly Father. Indeed, we have the best authority for regarding the whole group of virtues that together make up the perfection of the child's character as the model for the behaviour-pattern for the denizens of the Kingdom of Heaven.

Nor are these virtues confined to those that directly envisage God as our Father. There are a number of other virtues characteristic of children that in ordinary adult life and on the plane of natural morality are scarcely regarded as virtues at all, but are unquestionably virtues in the Kingdom of Heaven and conspicuous in all the great saints.

The simplicity of doves, utter singleness of purpose, devotion that does not stop to count the cost, care-free assurance of food and clothing, and the power of living in the moment without regard for evils beyond the horizon of today, these virtues on the supernatural plane are recommended by the evangelical counsels as in a peculiar degree suited for those who would live supernaturally, and on the natural plane are among the most characteristic virtues of childhood. None of them on either plane have the father as their immediate object in the sense in which, for example, the child's obedience has; but on both planes they take the father for granted and flourish in proportion as his authority and care is effectively experienced and unquestioningly accepted. On the natural plane, therefore, they flourish best in childhood; and the more firmly they are established as natural virtues in childhood the more readily their supernatural counterparts are developed in maturity, for the supernatural builds upon the natural.

If, on the other hand, the opportunity for developing these virtues is missed in childhood the supernatural outlook (which has to be possessed in some degree by all Christians, and not only by religious and the great saints) will be difficult to acquire in adult life. A heavy responsibility, therefore, lies upon the educational experimentalist who deliberately forces upon boys and girls a régime from which parents and teachers are eliminated as far as possible so as to leave a community in which the children are supposed to manage their own affairs, take upon themselves what are essentially adult functions and stand to one another virtually in the relation of adult to adult.

F. R. HOARE.

TEACHING SOCIAL DOCTRINE TO CHILDREN

"THE duty of masters, mistresses and other superiors, is to take proper care of those under their charge, and to enable them to practise their religious duties." "It is dishonest in servants to waste their master's time and property, because it is wasting what is not their own." And this, adequate perhaps for juvenile domestic service, is all we turn them out with. Some of us may feel tempted to add to the Catechism. Social teaching, however, calls for more than Catechism methods of exposition, and before discussing methods it will be well first to be clear about needs and aims.

The working boy leaves school at fourteen to face a life of work in surroundings marked, in varying degrees, by fatigue, dirt, dishonesty, indecency. I have heard a good trade unionist say that it took him years

to get over the shock of that change from school to work. Yet the aim of school is to prepare the child for after life. The problem is how to bridge the gap. The lad may soon acquire the mind of the majority of his mates—to carry through his work with as little trouble as possible and to get what pleasure he can out of the end of the day when work is over. Or he may be led before he is much older to question the purpose of his work, to accept a critical attitude towards the régime that controls his life, while it may never occur to him that his religion has any bearing on these matters. He may soon become a man in his own estimation; he may, before long, hear and be drawn into discussions, find interest in trade union affairs and political movements. Youth not infrequently goes faster than its elders.

School has to prepare the working boy for all this; not merely to protect him against danger, certainly not to encourage an attitude of indifference to the life around him, but rather in the hope that he may develop serious interest and powers of judgement; that, supported by his Faith, he may in a small way aspire to leadership. A working miner in his early twenties had shown marked qualities in a youth movement that was "left". In seeking admission to the Catholic Workers' College he tried quite simply to express his misgivings and his aims: "I want to see things always as I saw life on the day of my First Communion." Plainly his Catholic school had done something to prepare him for life, and yet, too, something was missing.

One cannot demand everything of the elementary school or expect a child of fourteen to leave fully equipped to face the world's problems. Again, social instruction—the subject of this discussion—at best can only be part of his formation; it is needed in order to do fuller justice to the pains already taken to form his character and to train him in religious and domestic duties.

At best, much of his social education must remain to be accomplished after he has left school. Work itself should provide education, a genuine, if not formal, apprenticeship. A lad took his job to his north-country foreman, "Is that good enough?" "Nowt's good enough, thou must do thy best." The lesson was remembered long after, but perhaps little education of that type is found under modern working conditions. "Labour, intended by Providence for the good of soul and body, often becomes an instrument of perversion; dead matter leaves the factory improved while men are corrupted and degraded." Formal education is provided by continuation classes; and we ought to consider the possibility of some place being found, along with the classes, for definite religious and social training. Our clubs and guilds and the Young Catholic Workers make plans for social teaching as the working boy or girl grows of age to form judgements and gains experience to which the teaching fits, and so seek ends that cannot be fully attained at school. But work and home must play their part; the whole medium must be reformed and this requires instruction for those who shape the boy's surroundings, for pupils of adult age. The problem, then, of social teaching for school children must be seen as part only of a much wider field. Its place is preparatory and subsidiary to the social training of the adult and of the working boy and girl.

What should be our aims? How much can we hope usefully to teach our children, taking them up to the present school-leaving age? What

main difficulties stand in the way? It may help us to answer these questions if we look first at what is already done for those of other types and ages.

For many years past, the Catholic Social Guild has offered a syllabus of social studies for secondary schools, along with examinations. The syllabus is not worked out in detail. It is but an outline of subjects, along with recommendations of textbooks—some of them originally written for this purpose—and an indication of supplementary reading, under four main headings:

- (a) The history and doctrine of *Rerum Novarum*.
- (b) Economics and general social problems.
- (c) Citizenship.
- (d) International relations.

The choice of subject is left to the school, and the first of these has generally been the most popular. The courses are intended for upper forms and they seem to meet the needs and capacity of the age group 15–17. It is calculated that any one of these courses would demand one lesson a week for the greater part of the year. A two-hour examination paper is set by the Guild at either of two appointed dates in the year. Though certainly one would not recommend the examination method for younger children, here it does provide both a stimulus and a means of estimating results. There is a tendency at times to memorize lessons, textbooks, encyclical passages; there are blunders, of course, but the general results show a good standard of work, genuine interest and a fairly accurate grasp of main facts and principles.

Results appear in other ways. At a day school, mainly of scholarship pupils in an industrial centre, it was found that the children took their books and lessons home, and argued things out with their fathers till late hours. Some years ago, with a school of a different type, the courses aroused protests from some parents. A university teacher found, or appeared to find, a better social sense among Catholics coming to the university than among others. Pupils were cross-questioned, the existence of these courses was discovered, and, rightly or wrongly, they were credited with the difference.

One regrets that the number of boys' schools able to find time for these courses is less than that of girls' schools, but some of our public schools have arrangements of their own. For two of them now, I believe, a special paper is set by the Oxford and Cambridge Joint Examination Board and the social encyclicals are included as set texts. In other schools the subject is taken by upper forms in part of the religious doctrine time, with arrangements for discussion. Perhaps a combination of voluntary work with formal time-table lessons is best. A secondary day school for boys produced excellent results in later life by classes taken voluntarily by masters and boys after school hours. One frequently finds that interest aroused at school creates a readiness, even an eagerness, to give a helping hand in our work when occasion comes. Leading on to social study circles in the universities, it has given us some very useful young lecturers and writers and may come to provide that service of intellectual leadership for which the heritage of our Catholic social teaching clamours.

But how much can be expected from children under fourteen? And what will be the best line of approach? Social principles cannot be under-

stood apart from facts. Deep appreciation can be looked for only with the experience of later life. And if grasp of principles is to be built on facts, then a strictly catechism method must be inadequate and necessarily narrow, though Fr. O'Kane's very popular *Catholic Catechism of Social Questions* will be found to give more than mere questions and answers. It is suggested that young people should be introduced to some of the facts of their own immediate surroundings by visits to subjects of interest, or by little schemes of enquiries deliberately planned in order to focus thought on the principles involved.

Civics find place in many school curricula—a knowledge of the origins and working of the institutions by which we are governed, particularly those of the locality. Good textbooks abound, but two Catholic books may be mentioned and might be considered by a teacher in search of material, Miss Cunningham's *The Christian Citizen* (Catholic Social Guild), which has helped to stimulate citizenship for many a child, and Mr. Somerville's *Civics*, formerly published under the title *Who Is My Neighbour?* (Harding & More). This last was not intended only for Catholic schools and it includes good treatment of such topics as capital and labour, trade unionism, international relations.

But it will be specially desirable to give the children some introduction to the social encyclicals; a little foundation upon which the young man or woman will later fall back for comfort and direction in the difficulties and perplexities of working life; some realization of the fundamentals beneath the duties of the day, something that will help towards an understanding of the loving sympathy of the Catholic Church; something that will even help to inspire a sense of apostolate. This would be the ideal, and to those of our people who have come to know and love the riches of the encyclicals, it must appear imperative.

An elementary schoolmaster has told us that he found his older boys able to appreciate *Rerum Novarum* and to enjoy it; but then they were reflecting his own enthusiasm, and actual results with some of them have, to our knowledge, proved his claim to be true. The task is not easy. *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno* are in fact deep treatises on social philosophy. Misunderstandings and misinterpretations are not infrequent on the part of those who attempt to teach and popularize Catholic social doctrine. Simplification is not merely a matter of language and we cannot hope to do more than supply an outline of certain fundamentals. Yet it does seem desirable that children, before they are launched into the wider world, should at least be aware of the existence of these documents, of the Church's concern with the worker's problems, of a little about the history, occasions and events, which prompted the Popes to speak; something, too, of the great heroes of the Catholic social movement of modern times.

There is the danger that the teacher, particularly if he is himself not well versed in social doctrine, will colour the lesson with his own personal political views. He, no more than his pupils, can learn the matter catechism-wise. A set scheme for his use will hardly suffice; he will need himself to be interested, himself to come to the classroom with solid foundations. The key to the problem lies with the training college. A solution will be met more than half-way if the college curriculum includes

a good social grounding. One training college has taken the matter in hand and experimented in method with practice classes. The experiment may yet help us to find the rest of the solution. Another college manifests enterprise and enthusiasm, runs reading and discussion groups on ordered lines, not as a professional task but for the sheer interest in the subject, and happily in evacuation has found means of putting this knowledge to the test by establishing and guiding a social study group for working girls. The instructed teacher is greater than any scheme and eventually the teacher will discover the best way for himself. The writer is conscious that he speaks from theory rather than from practice, and if others, the younger teachers especially, can let us have their experience and their views, then THE CLERGY REVIEW may be able to offer something more useful than the present article.

Meanwhile, let me suggest a course for elementary school children based on the Encyclical *Rerum Novarum*. Let us remember that this document is now fifty years old and must be understood in the light of the problems of 1891 and of other countries besides our own; remember, too, that it does not give the last word, for there are other documents, notably *Quadragesimo Anno*, of at least equal importance and authority.

I would ask the teacher first to read something of the origins of the Encyclical and the work of Leo's followers and predecessors as outlined in Mrs. Crawford's *The Church and the Worker* and in an article by Fr. Watt in THE CLERGY REVIEW for May, 1941, now available in pamphlet form—*Leo XIII and the Social Movement*. He should also consult some textbooks on social history. He might also glance at Mgr. Parkinson's Introduction to our pamphlet text of the Encyclical and Cardinal Manning's essay, included with other useful matter in *The Dignity and Rights of Labour* (Burns Oates & Washbourne). Let him then get a general view of the main points of the Encyclical with the help of Fr. Watt's *Christian Social Reform* and his *Handbook to Rerum Novarum*, and finally get a general plan of the whole as given, for example, in Mgr. Parkinson's Analysis at the end of the text.

He may then proceed to a reading of *Quadragesimo Anno*, perhaps with the help of Fr. Watt's *Pius XI and Social Reconstruction* and conclude with a more detailed study of the central doctrine of that Encyclical, the theory of society known as corporatism or vocational groups or *The Guild Social Order*, using the C.S.G. booklet of this title. He may care to follow on with a reading of the very beautiful Encyclical *Divini Redemptoris*, for which he will derive much help from Mr. F. J. Sheed's *Communism and Man*. The total cost of the pamphlets mentioned, apart from the books, is 3s., but the assimilation of all this will take time and will mean a good deal of work. It is, in the writer's opinion, the desirable minimum for the teacher who wants to arrive at a balanced view of the subject. His reading will be all the more profitable if he is able to talk things over with others, and he might learn much for himself and put his conception of principles to the test by a little spare-time work given to leading and helping in a study circle of working men.

Thus prepared he will, needless to say, serve up but a very small portion of his own knowledge to the children. He will not attempt to treat the text of *Rerum Novarum* by taking each paragraph in isolation, an un-

satisfactory method even for adults, but he will explain in outline some of the main points of Pope Leo's teaching. He will from time to time let them see and handle and read passages of the actual text so that they may feel, as it were, the Pope's own words. He will illustrate his lessons by reference to the historical setting and to actual questions of more recent times. Let him not exaggerate the glories of the Middle Ages, or the horrors of the industrial revolution, the wickedness of the factory, or the hardships of the worker today.

It will be best, perhaps, if the teacher works out his own syllabus. It will not be the same as a plan that he would make for, say, weekly or monthly discussions with older minds in a branch of a Catholic society. Here, however, is a scheme, given merely as a sample.

(1) *Early Factory and Working Conditions.* Industrial development. Workpeople and their lives. Young workers, ages and conditions. Slow reform by factory legislation. The reformers. Progress resisted in the name of false social doctrine.

What Popes Leo XIII and Pius XI say about the rise of modern industry, oppression of the workers, misuse of wealth and power. Why the State should help the workers and the poor. Protection of young workers. Hours and conditions of work.

Existing laws regulating factory work today, for adults and young people; how these are enforced and how far these are suspended at the present time.

(*The Church and the Worker*, cc. 1-3. R.N., nn. 2, 26, 27, 29, 33, 35. Q.A., 3, 4, 58, 60. *Rerum Novarum and Social Institutions in Great Britain*.)

(2) *The Old Craft Guilds.* What they did; their decay and suppression. Mutual help; rights and duties; self-governing; religious inspiration. What the Popes say about the Guilds. R.N., 2, 36. Q.A., 78, 97.

Early trade unionism, efforts and mistakes; attempts at repression; growth of trade unions. Are trade unions like the old guilds?

The right to form trade unions and other associations within the State. Duties also. What the Popes say on this. R.N., 36, 38, 40 ff. Q.A., 34-5.

Different kinds of trade unions today, craft and general; trades councils; the T.U.C. What trade unions do; "benefits", etc. Could the idea in the old guilds be brought back into modern industry?

(*The Church and the Worker*, c. 3. Somerville: *Why the Guilds Decayed. A Study Course on Trade Unionism—T.U.C.*)

(3) *Wages.* Wages of labourers, craftsmen, farm workers; time and piece work; wages of recent years and of 40 years ago compared; money wages and real wages; Truck Acts; how and when wages are paid.

How wages are settled; individual bargaining; need for combination; collective bargaining and agreements; sweated industries, origin and work of trade boards; joint industrial councils; arbitration tribunals; unemployment insurance giving some protection to wage levels?

Meaning of justice in exchange, and how justice should enter into wages. What Leo XIII says about the just minimum wage for the adult labourer; his reasons. (R.N., 34.)

(4) *How the Church helps the Worker.* The social Encyclicals and why the Church has the right and duty to speak on these questions. Pagan idea of labour, slavery; Christian doctrine of rights and dignity of man, purpose of life, work, use of wealth. Example of Christ and doctrine of sanctification. Christian works of charity; institutions and religious orders. The old guilds; doctrine of just price and usury.

The Catholic reaction to the evils of the industrial revolution; Ketteler, Harmel, de Mun, Manning; the origin of *Rerum Novarum*. Decurtins, Leo XIII and others preparing the way for international labour agreements (why?), and the International Labour Office. The Catholic social movement abroad. The Catholic Social Guild and Catholic Workers' College.

(R.N., 13-24. Q.A., 3-24. *The Church and the Worker*, cc. 4, 5, 9. *Leo XIII and the Social Movement*.)

(5) *Materialistic Movements.* Harmful associations. Class war doctrine. Denial of God; force replaces right. Contrast of Communist and Catholic doctrine.

The right to own property, subject to State's care for good of all. Wage-earner's position to be made more secure by access to ownership and by recognition of his standing in industry.

(Somerville: *Revolution in Review*. R.N., 40, 15, 18, 8. Q.A., 58-60, 65, 83. *Divini Redemptoris*.)

¶ (6) *The Family and the State.* Who does the house-work, saving, spending; the kind of house you would like; authority in the family; what school does to help; wartime difficulties for home and family.

Natural for man to live in society; willed by God, so authority of State comes from God, for common good and subject to His law; but forms of State and other societies designed by man.

Family, however, constituted by God; with purpose and rights of its own which do not come from the State, though the family needs to live with other families in the State. How the State helps all families. When the State should help the family in difficulties. Social services which help the worker's family. What rights should the Church, the family, the State claim in regard to school and education?

(R.N., 11. *Casti Connubii*, C.T.S. ed., p. 62.)

LEO O'HEA, S.J.

THE CO-REDEMPTION CONTROVERSY

THE question of co-redemption in its main outline is this: had Our Blessed Lady any immediate share in the act which redeemed us? By saying "immediate" one postulates more than the free consent She gave to the Incarnation; by "the act which redeemed us" the question is removed from the sphere of application of the fruits of redemption: the words also imply an *active* share.

Today (so far as any judgement is possible) the reply of theologians is increasingly in the affirmative. Their position recalls that of the schoolmen supporting the Immaculate Conception: they have numbers on their side and a strong appeal to piety, but they are faced by most formidable opponents and difficulties as yet unsolved.

The two main difficulties are these: (i) It is formally revealed that Our Lord is the unique price of our redemption: of that there is no doubt. On the other hand, it may only possibly be implicitly contained in tradition that Our Lady had a share in the act of redemption: that is far from being proved. In such a collision of rights, principles demand that the stronger prevail. (ii) Any share of Our Blessed Lady in the act of redemption must be an act done in virtue of divine grace—a fruit of the redemption, therefore. Now how can a cause be integrated by its own effect? Or did Our Blessed Lady in some way redeem herself?

These considerations taken along with the late and not unequivocal unfolding of the idea of co-redemption (the earliest effective witness is apparently Rupertus Tuitiensis, twelfth century) move certain theologians to preach and practise caution. They do not deny the devotional appeal of the new devotion; they think it a theologian's duty to be unmoved by it, and they fear the other side is failing in that duty. The solution lies, they would say, not in amassing doubtfully useful texts from tradition for a doctrine which is still not shown to be possible, but in a profounder study of Our Lord's redemption in all its aspects.

The Scotus of the present controversy had not yet appeared. In a recent Spanish work,¹ however, a parallel is suggested² which goes some way towards meeting the major difficulties.

What follows here is a partial working-out of that parallel with a practical conclusion. It has been claimed that the "*sensus fidelium*" is naturally averse from the full idea of co-redemption. If that be so, the case for co-redemption weakens by comparison with the Immaculate Conception controversy in which the faithful were so strongly for the doctrine. It may not be without pastoral scope to ask how far that claim is true.

Here is the parallel, first of all.

In personal justification, theologians, following Trent, distinguish a remote and a proximate preparation. The remote preparation comprises faith, fear, attrition, etc., achieved by actual graces. The proximate preparation is contrition with its motion towards God and away from sin: the love of God for Himself. This act is achieved not by actual

¹ Alastruey (G.), *Mariologia*, Tomus II, Valladolid (Cuesta), 1941.

² Not apparently for the first time. Merkelbach (and perhaps Friethoff)—both O.P.—have preceded.

grace (in the commoner view), but by the incoming sanctifying grace. There is, apparently, a dovetailing of different causalities. As active principle, sanctifying grace produces and therefore precedes contrition. Contrition, on the other hand, supplies to the soul the capacity for receiving sanctifying grace; contrition, as they say, is thus prior in the order of material causality. The example sometimes offered is that of the inrushing wind (active principle) and the opening windows (material, or receptive principle).

The fact of this active collaboration of the soul in its own justification is, of course, a point of faith. Luther's view made the soul purely inanimate in the process; as though we should become less than human when God handles us for His highest purposes! None the less, it is generally agreed (though frankly the present writer finds it hard to understand) that absolutely speaking God could justify the sinner without any action on his part. Of course He is always the supreme cause in any hypothesis: the unique principal cause of justification. But apparently He could dispense with any mediation on the part of the very soul He justifies. One sees at once, however, the high seemliness of His moving us to Himself along the lines of our own nature, which is active through free will even when He supernaturalizes us.

To come now to justification-at-source—the objective redeeming of us by Our Saviour's passion and death. Two points need emphasizing. (i) Given the decree of condign satisfaction, Our Lord's work *ipso facto* becomes unique. In all hypotheses it would have been infinite in worth, but now it is the juridically necessary price and the only one such. Anything that God decrees to accept from any other source, cannot be for the *esse*, but only for the *bene esse*, of redemption. (ii) Our Lord shared in our flesh and blood, but not in its need for redemption. He worked in our nature and for it, without Himself receiving the main benefit. His Sacred Humanity, though of course not the principal cause, and though, too, deriving certain accidental effects from the redemptive act, is none the less the active principle of redemption; only our debtor-race is the patient.

Now it would clearly verify the full idea of co-redemption, if, in virtue of a special decree for the *bene esse* of objective redemption, God were to introduce some activity of the debtor-race such as we must hold, *mutatis mutandis*, exists in the process of individual, subjective redemption. Such activity would have to be invested with very definite qualities: it would demand a person really belonging to the debtor-race yet so elevated as to be its representative in the solemn and sacred function of willingly accepting the universal boon of redemption; and all would have to proceed from a clear divine decree supplementary to the main decree of redemption, which absolutely would not demand it. Moreover, it would be useless to talk of the fact, unless God had revealed that decree.

But at present, the main contention turns upon the *possibility* of such co-operation on the part of our race, and the two chief difficulties in the way of it; and the present approach does seem to make them dwindle. For the obvious characteristics of such activity are: (i) that it would not be addable or subtractable in respect of the unique work of Our Lord; (ii) it would itself be an effect of that work and yet truly con-causal with it. In other words, no jot or tittle would be lost of Our Lord's unique mediatorship and satisfaction; nor would it be necessary to view as

impossible a contribution to the producing of redemption from what is an effect of redemption. It is only necessary to think of our own co-operation in the receiving of sanctifying grace to make this clear. The act of perfect contrition is *our* action; not remotely, but immediately, it does justify us; and yet without detracting one whit from the unique divine causality. And that last fact is true, because human conversion to God is the result of His converting of us to Himself—is therefore analagous not univocal with that, and cannot trench upon, but only enhance it.

So also with co-operation in universal redemption. In Our Blessed Lady we have a member of the debtor-race, who needed and drew redemption from the Cross, yet in so much nobler a manner than the rest of us, that by that alone She was fitted to represent us all in that sacred place. Nor is there lacking evidence in Sacred Scripture (though both sides agree that it is inconclusive) for the special divine decree establishing such representational acceptance of redemption for our race. Our Lady's being present on Calvary is in itself significant: She was not there at other great, but not supreme, moments such as the Sermon on the Mount and the Last Supper. Moreover, Her presence there was rewarded with the ratification of Her spiritual motherhood of all men, as is generally agreed, in the "Ecce filius tuus!". May that not be because She there was accomplishing by Her "com-passio" directly and immediately what She had remotely prepared by Her consent to the Incarnation: namely, Her function of accepting redemption on behalf of the whole race? One is forced by the silence of the first thousand years to be hesitant in claiming the fact; but the possibility seems clear.

Whether or no that activity would merit for Mary the name of "Co-redemptrix" is another matter; one, however, which now is beyond all doubt. With his customary balance Fr. De la Taille diagnosed the admission of that title as belonging to the pastoral, not the theological, office: *sunt divisiones gratiarum*. The supreme Pastor and increasingly the Catholic episcopate has admitted it. There can be no question about its legitimacy. Some would restrict its meaning purely to the order of subjective, or applied, redemption. They are free to do so; they must at least agree that if co-operation (such as has been described) in the very gaining of redemption be considered (though not admitted perhaps), the title would be *a fortiori* justified.

Since the official teachers of the Church have sanctioned the use of the title Co-redemptrix, we can leave aside scruples as to the danger of widespread misunderstanding of it on the part of the faithful. It is the opposite contention which needs a word of comment: the contention that the instinctive reaction of the faithful is away from any participation with Our Lord in His unique work of objectively redeeming us.

Well, of course, so it is, and rightly so; and if that were the only way to put the matter of co-redemption, one could never get anywhere with the doctrine: it would have to be discarded.

But if anything is plain from the way one has tried to envisage the doctrine in this article, it is that the unique, solely satisfying, infinite, and juridically necessary work of Our Lord does not exclude assistance of *another order*—any more than the imparticipable divine action excludes created instrumentality, however little it may need it.

In other words, we are faced with yet another instance of the rôle of analogy in theology; and there is no more question here of ascribing to Our Blessed Lady activity on the same plane with Our Lord than there is, for instance, in metaphysics the intention of predicating being univocally of God and His creatures. The question is one of co-operation *in the same action*—not on the same level.

Certain theologians (who may well have arrived at the right *conclusion*) have urged the premise that Redemption is, in its strict aspect, the paying of a price, which, they would argue, *stat in indivisibili*. Either Our Lord paid the whole of it, and then there is nothing for Our Lady to do; or He only paid part and then He is not our Saviour in the revealed sense.

In other parts of theology that reasoning would not pass: it proves far too much. One remembers frequent points on the beaten track where actions are acceptedly the product of two causes—not part of one and part of the other, but wholly of either. The whole point of analogous entities is that they simply refuse to add up. If you have two battalions in the field and somebody sends you the photograph of a third, you are no stronger in the field, however real be the entity of the third *in another order*.

In practice, therefore, if the question of co-redemption be put to the faithful as connoting some share in the uniqueness of Our Lord's activity, the *sensus fidelium* will no doubt recoil strongly from it—the stronger the better. It also recoils strongly from the idea of sharing in the divine attributes, or the divine nature, if you put the matter after the Brahmin, or the Annie Besant fashion.

I had just read some such contention about the unfavourable reaction of the Catholic instinct to co-redemption when a letter was put into my hands—an acknowledgement of sympathy after a very crushing bereavement. This is what I read:

"... It seems as if his sacrifice was to renounce the power to offer sacrifice—his one Mass to give up his Mass, after his heroic efforts to prepare himself—and that we are asked to give our free co-operation, like Our Lady at the foot of the Cross. . . ."

It would not seem that the reaction of the faithful is against any share in the action by which we were redeemed, however loath to place it on the same plane as Our Lord's unique work.

THOMAS HOLLAND.

THE PERSONAL MESSAGE OF THE GOSPEL

ALMOST the last words to fall from the lips of the Saviour of the world before His triumphant return to whence He had come in lowliness, were a solemn promise that He would be with His own until the world's last day (Matt. xxviii, 20). *Ecce ego vobiscum sum usque ad consummationem saeculi*. Yet He was about to leave them, and it is certain that those who heard the promise were not going to escape the universal law of death. We must, therefore, understand Our Lord's promise as made to a far wider audience than the five hundred gathered around Him on a Galilean moun-

tain. *Qui usque ad consummationem saeculi cum discipulis se futurum esse promittit, et illos ostendit semper victuros, et se numquam a credentibus recessurum*, is St. Jerome's commentary (cf. *Rom. Brev. feria vi infra Oct. Pasch*). The promise, that is, was made to the persons on the mountain, in the first instance, but equally so to those who were to take their places in future ages, down to the return of the Saviour on the clouds of heaven. The remark of St. Jerome suggests some thoughts on Bible reading which I submit not because they are new, but in the hope that they may help to make this most important study, or rather meditation, even more profitable than some of us may have found it in the past.

Of the Eucharist, in which the Incarnate Word of God becomes the wayfarer's food on his journey from time to eternity, St. Ignatius of Antioch says that it is "a medicine that procures immortality, an antidote against death". (*Ad. Eph. xx.*) The written word of God, on the other hand, enlightens our mind by its heavenly teaching, whilst the heart is set aflame as we contemplate the actions and the preaching of Him whose words are "spirit and life". But there is a risk of a very great deal of that "spirit and life" escaping us, unless we read intelligently. "All Scripture, inspired by God, is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice" (2 Tim. iii, 16). But, again, no small portion of these precious advantages may be forfeited if in our reading we fail to apply a most important canon or rule of interpretation.

The official canons of Biblical hermeneutics have been established long ago, so that it would be as rash as it would be foolish to endeavour to improve on them. In this sensitive sphere, where the lover of novelty easily goes astray, it is imperative to follow the principle laid down by St. Peter who, when he tells us that "no prophecy of Scripture is made by private interpretation" (2 Peter i, 20), had in mind both the supernatural inspiration of the men who wrote and those who read and explain, who must do so with humility and utter detachment from mere personal views. The Catholic Church alone is the official guardian of Holy Writ and its unerring exponent, since she is "the pillar and ground of truth" (1 Tim. iii, 15); hence no one in his senses would suggest that the rules of interpretation laid down by her are not adequate. Yet it may be permissible to make a suggestion, which is in no way new or original, but which may prove of enormous profit to the devout reader of the sacred volume. Briefly it comes to this: If we would have the Scriptures, and more particularly the Gospels, to come to fullest life, for our personal edification, and the enrichment of mind and heart, we must not read the sacred pages in a purely historic perspective. On the contrary, we should regard that narrow strip of mountainous and largely desert-like territory which runs due north and south, for a couple of hundred miles, along the Eastern Mediterranean, as a kind of stage set up by divine Providence before the eyes of the whole world. At an hour fixed from eternity there appeared on that stage the very Son of the eternal God, arrayed in the garb of our mortal nature; and the things which the divine actor—if such a word may be applied to the Holy One of God—did and spoke in that setting, historically so remote from us, He did and spoke not merely for the benefit of those who were near to Him in space and time—for the benefit, so to speak, of the occupiers of the front seats—but equally for the profit of the

many who are far removed by the circumstances of space and time. A good speaker, or actor, does not play or act only for those near the stage; on the contrary, he does his best to make himself heard by those also perched high up in the gallery.

The most recent miracle of modern science suggests another, and even better simile—namely that of a man who speaks into the microphone. By this time the broadcasting of an evening service by some chosen parish priest has lost its novelty, though a certain amount of excitement always goes with it. The service is the usual Sunday evening service, but the items have been selected with particular care. The preparation of the address has occupied the preceding week's studious hours and all is now ready. When, at the appointed hour, the preacher goes into the pulpit he sees before him his habitual congregation, reinforced, no doubt, by many who do not, as a rule, attend in the evening, but who like to broadcast their own voices in the hymns, if they are given a chance. (Some, of course, will stay at home in order to see how their parish priest sounds on the wireless!)

As for the preacher, he addresses the audience in front of him and they see and hear him in the usual way. But all the time the speaker is conscious of a far vaster, though unseen, audience who listen to his words in all sorts of places, far and near, by the domestic hearth, in sickrooms and hospital wards, on the high seas and even in distant countries. To all these different people, the preacher speaks just as immediately and directly as to those within the four walls of the church.

I hope I shall not be taxed with irreverence if I suggest that we view Our Lord's ministry, more especially His teaching, somewhat after the fashion I have described. We are among those of whom St. Peter wrote, who have no personal knowledge of Christ, but whose faith would be "found unto praise and glory, and honour, at the appearing of Jesus Christ, Whom having not seen you love: in whom also now, though you see Him not, you believe: and believing, shall rejoice with joy unspeakable and glorified" (1 Peter i, 7, 8). We have not seen Jesus, just as the listener at a distance does not see the priest who broadcasts. For all that, Our Lord's words come to us, through the Gospels, with as much actuality and directness as if He were speaking to us here and now. Jesus Christ is the teacher, as He is the Saviour, of the men and women of every period of history. In the Sacraments, above all in the Holy Eucharist, He still carries on His redeeming and sanctifying task for the individual soul. In like manner, His words, as recorded in the Gospels, which stirred and converted hearts when they were first uttered in far off Palestine, are also spoken to every successive generation and to every individual man and woman, down to the world's last day.

Therefore, whenever the context does not obviously limit the meaning of Our Lord's words to a given situation, or to a particular person, we should take them as spoken to ourselves, as immediately as to those who heard them twenty centuries ago. There is nothing new, or arbitrary, in this view; the pity is that it is not always acted upon. A hundred texts could be quoted, if it were necessary, to substantiate this fact. Let it suffice to refer once again to St. Jerome's commentary on Our Lord's promise that He would be with His own until the end of time.

What wisdom, knowledge, strength and comfort shall we not derive from our contemplation of the Gospel if we read it in the light of this principle? We very properly say "My Jesus", thereby as it were appropriating Him and claiming Him all for ourselves. We may do this with complete freedom for, like the sun in the sky, which by reason of its remoteness is able to shed its light and warmth upon a whole continent and upon every individual that dwells in it, Jesus sees and knows and loves those who belong to Him both in the mass and as individuals. Hence when He spoke, long ago, He addressed Himself to each and all, however remote in space and time they may be.

St. Paul, speaking of the Old Law, assures us that "what things soever were written, were written for our learning, that through patience and the comfort of the Scriptures we might have hope" (Rom. xv, 4); and all the pages of the Old Testament "were written for our correction"—that is for the benefit of us modern men and women, "upon whom the ends of the world are come" (1 Cor. x, 11). How much more true all this is of what is written in the New Testament!

For the purpose of illustrating what has been said, let us take a concrete example. At no time of His life did Our Lord open His Heart quite so unreservedly as during the last hours of His mortal existence. In the course of those intimate conversations, of which St. John gives us a summary—an all-too-brief summary, where we would give so much for a little more—Our Lord, among other momentous statements, uttered these words: "As the Father hath loved me, I also have loved you" (John xv, 9). This was spoken, in the first instance, to the Apostles and to others who may have been present, but they were certainly meant for all Christ's followers. The Church in her liturgy, the Fathers, and the theologians, have always read the discourses related in chapters xiv, xv, xvi of St. John as much more than mere personal farewell discourses addressed to the Apostolic College. A whole theology of the Church has been built up on Our Lord's picture of Himself as the Vine of which we all are the living branches. In His prayer to the Father, at the end of the Supper—the so-called priestly prayer—as He stood in the Upper Room, with eyes and hands raised to heaven, He stated in as many words that His prayer was not limited to the Apostles: "And not for them only do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in me: that they all may be one" (John xvii, 20, 21). In like manner, surely Our Lord's declaration that "as the Father loved me, I also have loved you", though spoken to the fortunate guests at the table laid for them by Divine Wisdom, may also be regarded as addressed to each one of us as immediately as they were to those privileged ones. That there is no limitation in Christ's declaration, no more than there is in His other statement: "I am the Vine, you the branches," is clearly shown by the further remark that "if *anyone* abide not in me, he shall be cast forth as a branch, and shall wither, and they shall gather him up, and cast him into the fire" (John xv, 5, 6), and many other passages in those priceless chapters of St. John's Gospel.

"As the Father hath loved me, I also have loved you." The verbs are in the past tense: that does not mean that they point to a past event. On the contrary, since both the Man Jesus and the Evangelist who preserved His words spoke in a very different idiom from ours, we must interpret

them according to the genius or character of the tongue in which they were uttered. Here the past tense simply describes a state, an abiding condition, something that, from the standpoint of the creature, began, and now goes on, but which, from God's standpoint, is an everlasting, changeless operation. The past, then, should here, as in so many other passages of Holy Writ, be rendered by the present: "As the Father loves me, so do I love you." If we grasp this principle, the assurance of Our Lord becomes like an unfailing spring of inspiration, welling up from the depths of our soul and flooding it with ever renewed waves of joy and quiet strength.

We would have the measure of Our Lord's love for us? Very well, the standard by which we must gauge that love is none other than the Eternal Father's love for His Only-Begotten Son. That love is inconceivable—it is as vast and as deep, as sweet and as strong as that boundless ocean of Goodness and Beauty which we call God. With what absorbing interest the Father watched His beloved Son whilst He "went about among men, doing good" (Acts x, 38)! On two occasions, at least, the Father seemed, so to speak, unable to restrain Himself—He must perforce break the solemn silence which ever enshrouds Him, to proclaim aloud to the whole world His love for His Son and His delight in Him whom He had sent forth to save it. At the opening of His public life, in the hour of His baptism, as Jesus emerged from the waters of Jordan and stood with eyes and hands raised in prayer, a mighty voice from heaven suddenly resounded through the narrow valley: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Matt. iii, 17). The love of the Father was once more revealed to three favoured mortals in the mysterious hour of Christ's transfiguration, together with an injunction that they—and all men—should hearken to Him (Matt. xvii, 5). Here, then, we have the measure of Our Lord's love for us—for each individual human being—for St. Paul did not speak selfishly, but spoke in the name of each of us when he wrote the wonderful words: "I live in the faith of the Son of God, *who loved me and delivered himself for me*" (Gal. ii, 20).

The thought of a love such as this should drive far from our hearts all doubt, despondency or fear. However great our natural weakness, and though our enemies may storm and rage about us, what is there to fear, since we are wrapped about with the wondrous love of our Saviour—a love that is as strong, as constant, as unchanging as the love with which God the Father embraces His beloved Son and takes His delight in Him.

Only by reading the Gospel in this light shall we get out of it all that it is capable of yielding. Let us take Our Lord's words as spoken to ourselves, directly and immediately. To do so is no mere pious imagination. Our Lord saw us and spoke to us in the far off days of His mortal life in Palestine. If the sound of His words only reaches us now, it is because only now have we ears to hear, in much the same way as the words of one speaking into a microphone reach the ears of all his hearers, far and near, as the sound waves traverse the ether. Just as Christ loves us individually and gave Himself for each of us, so did He speak to all, no matter at what period of history we appear on this earth, for He is the Saviour of all men, their Teacher and their Friend.

ERNEST GRAF, O.S.B.

HOMILETICS

The Second Sunday of Lent

And He was transfigured before them. (Matt. xvii, 2.)

(1) The Gospel of today affords a striking contrast to that of last Sunday, in which was recorded the tempting of Our Lord by the devil. Then we read how the devil took Him to the top of a high mountain and showed Him the kingdoms of the world, exclaiming, "All these will I give thee if falling down thou wilt adore me." In the Gospel of today we read how Our Lord took three of His apostles to the top of a high mountain, but for a far different purpose. St. Matthew tells us that the Transfiguration took place only six days after Our Lord had thus spoken to His disciples: "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his own soul?" By allowing them to witness His Transfiguration Our Lord gave His Apostles a foretaste of the glorious destiny awaiting those who, acknowledging His divinity, faithfully fulfil the command of His Heavenly Father, "Hear ye him."

(2) Our Lord took with Him Peter, James, and John. Why these three in preference to the others? We see the reason from the fact that the same three were to be chosen to accompany their divine Master on the night of His agony. The vision on Thabor was to support their faith in its trial at Gethsemane.

(3) "There appeared to them Moses and Elias talking with Him." Moses represented the Law, while Elias represented the Prophets. The Gospel leads us to suppose that their conversation was brief, and that they soon disappeared. It is on a dark night that the stars appear. When day dawns the stars fade away. So too in the Old Testament in spite of the Law and the prophets the people "sat in darkness", a darkness to be dispelled by Him who said, "I am the light of the world."

(4) "Hear ye him." What are the mediums by which Our Lord speaks to us? First there is conscience, for God has written His law on "the fleshy tablets of the heart". Then we have the voice of the Church: "He that hears you hears me." God may also use such ordinary means as Catholic books, pamphlets or papers to convey His message to us; while, if our ears are properly attuned, we shall hear His voice in many incidents of our daily life.

(5) "And Jesus came and touched them and said to them: Arise and fear not. And they lifting up their eyes, saw no one but only Jesus." In the New Testament we read of many occasions where a striking manifestation of the divine glory or power caused fear in the beholders. It was so at the Transfiguration, and Our Lord calmed His apostles with those words so often on His lips: "Fear not." They saw "only Jesus"; so why be afraid? His heavenly Father had proclaimed Him to be the Son of God, but He had called His Apostles His friends. He is the bridge between the finite and the Infinite. While He loves us with an everlasting love He demands our love in return. Not a sentimental love, but a love that proves

itself by doing His Will: "If you love me keep my commandments." God grant us grace to do this, so that one day we too, like Moses and Elias, will have the happiness of conversing with Jesus face to face, and, like our divine Master, we too shall be transfigured.

Third Sunday of Lent

Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it. (Luke xii, 28.)

(1) At first sight the text I have quoted would seem to imply a belittling of Our Lady's dignity. But that is not so. The woman in the crowd, amazed at the power over devils displayed by Our Lord, and at his inexorable logic in confounding His enemies, cried out, "Blessed is the womb that bore thee." In so speaking, was she extolling the Mother of God? Unconsciously yes, consciously no. In effect her words would seem to do nothing more than congratulate the mother of a son who was a human prophet, powerful in word and deed.

(2) Our Lord's comment points out that Mary was above all pleasing in God's sight on account of her sinlessness, i.e. her incomparable fidelity in hearing the word of God and keeping it.

(3) The great privilege of the Immaculate Conception was given to Our Lady because God had chosen her to be the future mother of His Son. With the fulness of grace that God gave her Mary co-operated most perfectly even from her earliest years; she was constantly meditating on the words of God and "keeping them in her heart". Throughout her life her heart beat in unison with Jesus, not only as her Son but as her God. Small wonder, then, that the angel Gabriel saluted her with the words, "Blessed art thou amongst women", and that Our Lady herself, perfectly humble as she was, chanted in her sublime *Magnificat*, "all generations shall call me blessed".

(4) While Our Lady's position is unique and her sanctity unrivalled, we can share in her title of "blessed", provided we fulfil the condition of hearing the word of God and keeping it.

(5) To hear the word of God is not enough. We must "keep" it, i.e. put it into practice. Mere lip-service will not suffice. "These people honoureth me with their lips but their hearts are far from me," says the Scripture. Our Lord warns us that "not everyone who saith to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father". St. James, in the first chapter of his Epistle, repeats the teaching of his divine Master when he says: "Be ye doers of the word and not hearers only." He goes on to use a simile which ought to go home to many of us. "If a man be a hearer of the word and not a doer, he shall be compared to a man beholding his own countenance in a glass. For he beheld himself and went his way, and presently forgot what manner of man he was."

(6) If, then, the word of God reaches us by one or other of its many channels, and we see ourselves, as it were, in a mirror, let us not forget the image revealed, distasteful though it be, but put the "word" into practice and so earn the title of "blessed".

Fourth Sunday of Lent

But what are these among so many? (John vi, 9.)

(1) It is quite certain that Our Lord had in mind on this occasion the institution of the Blessed Sacrament. We read in St. John's Gospel, in the same chapter that records the miracle of the multiplication of the loaves and fishes, the account of Our Lord's promise of the Blessed Sacrament, given to those who had witnessed the miracle—a promise preceded by the words: "You seek me because you did eat of the loaves and were filled. Labour not for the meat which perisheth but for that which endureth unto life everlasting."

(2) Keeping in mind the connection between this miracle and the Blessed Sacrament, it is worthy of note that St. John mentions men only, though we know from St. Matthew that women and children were also present. Would that it were true that it is the great multitude of men thronging our altar rails that calls for special mention!

(3) "What are these among so many?" May not that question occur to the mind of many a priest as he looks into the ciborium? Unfortunately the number of sacred Hosts may be sufficient for those present, but what of the absent ones who ought to be there and who are weak for want of this heavenly nourishment!

(4) In the gospels of the last two Sundays we were commanded to hear Our Lord and were declared blessed if we heard His word and kept it. Today the Church chooses a gospel to remind us of our obligation to receive Holy Communion at Easter. Listen to Our Lord's words uttered shortly after the account of the miracle just read to you: "Amen, I say to you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood you shall not have life in you." So necessary is Holy Communion for us that Our Lord is constrained to warn us, even as a doctor might warn a patient who has no inclination to eat, by saying: "Unless you eat you will die."

(5) "Jesus, therefore, when he knew they would come to take him by force and make him king, fled again into the mountain, himself alone." Why did Our Lord act thus? Because the Jews were looking for an earthly king who would drive out the Romans and restore their independence. It is true that Our Lord was a king, as he later told Pilate; but His "kingdom was not of this world".

(6) Here on our altar, our little mountain, Our Lord remains alone behind the locked doors of the tabernacle. He has not fled there to avoid us, but rather to provide a meeting place where He can speak to our hearts. He wishes, nay, He demands that we proclaim Him king. The Church has shown the necessity of proclaiming Our Lord's Kingship, especially in the days in which we live, by instituting a feast of Christ the King. But, while Our Lord is pleased by our outward expressions of loyalty and adoration, He is not content with that alone. God became Incarnate that man might attain everlasting life, not automatically but by the use of the means Our Lord has provided. "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day"—and again—"He that eateth this bread shall live for ever."

Passion Sunday

Which of you shall convince me of sin? (John viii, 46.)

(1) The reference to Our Lord's Passion and Death is to be found in today's epistle, while the gospel is devoted to a discussion between Our Lord and the Jews. There is an intimate connection between the two. The connection can be deduced from the concluding words of the gospel: "Amen, amen, I say to you, before Abraham was made, I am. They took up stones, therefore, to throw at him; but Jesus hid himself and went out of the Temple."

(2) The gospel begins with Our Lord's challenge to His enemies: "Which of you shall convince me of sin?" It ends with the reason of His sinlessness, viz. because He is God. In the book of Esdras (chapter iii) we read that God said to Moses: "I am who I am. Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel: He who is, hath sent me to you." When, therefore, Our Lord said, "Before Abraham was made, I am", the Jews at once recognized that He claimed to be God, the Eternal Present, and took up stones to cast at Him, whom in their blindness they looked upon as a blasphemer.

(3) "Jesus hid himself." Not from fear. On another occasion Our Lord declared, "No man taketh my life from me, I lay it down of my self." He had decreed the time, the place and the manner of His death. The time was Good Friday, the place Mount Calvary, and the manner, crucifixion. Good Friday approaches when we commemorate Our Lord's death on Calvary by crucifixion, whereby the Lamb of God willingly offered Himself as a sacrifice for the sins of the world.

(4) "Which of you shall convince me of sin?" Not even the holiest of us would dare to issue such a challenge. Our consciences are apt to take a lenient view of our spiritual state. The more charitable of our neighbours may speak highly of the good deeds and edifying lives of many of us. But "he who judges us is the Lord", says St. Paul. The Psalmist cries out: "If thou, O Lord, shalt mark iniquities, Lord, who shall stand it?" And St. James reminds us that "in many things we all offend". If we judge ourselves aright and realize the holiness of God, there is not one of us who cannot in all sincerity echo the words of the publican in the gospel: "O God, be merciful to me a sinner."

(5) We are "convinced", i.e. convicted, of sin. The Passion of Our Lord takes away our sins only if we co-operate with the graces the Passion has obtained for us. With death stalking us from the skies the efficacy of the Passion in our individual case may be put to the final test at any time. Surely at a time like this faith must be lacking in the man who makes no effort to avoid serious sin, or, having committed it, makes no effort to remove it. Those who are conscious of living upright lives can still find room for improvement. Sin is the ultimate cause of war. We are asked to contribute to the war effort. What better contribution can we make than by getting rid of sin and joining the ranks of the just whose prayers pierce the clouds?

Palm Sunday

Tell ye the daughter of Sion, Behold thy king cometh to thee. (Matt. xxi, 5.)

(1) At first sight it would appear as though Our Lord's triumphant entry into Jerusalem and His crucifixion twelve days later were events so opposite in character as to have no real connection. Yet that there is a connection is revealed by the fact that the Church inserts the reading of the Passion in the Mass of Palm Sunday.

(2) The day of the Pasch, the feast on which the paschal lamb was sacrificed, was near at hand. The sacrifice prefigured the Sacrifice of the Lamb of God, who, as St. Paul says, "by His own blood entered once into the Holies, having obtained eternal redemption".

(3) It was but fitting that the divine Victim should enter the city of Jerusalem and the Temple in triumph, seeing that the Sacrifice of Calvary was not a defeat, but a glorious triumph over sin and death, as Easter Sunday demonstrates. Our Lord himself bears witness to this triumph when he says: "I, when I shall be lifted up, will draw all things to myself." St. John, who quotes these words, adds, "This he said, signifying what manner of death he should die" (John xii, 32, 33).

(4) Many of those who on Palm Sunday cried out "Hosanna to the son of David" would be found to have joined His enemies on Good Friday, who screamed, "Away with him . . . crucify him." It is likely that among His enemies were to be found the money-changers whose money Our Lord had scattered over the floor on this day. The fear of the loss of gain has always been a potent force in turning men away from religion, more especially if such loss can in any way be attributed to the Church. May not Our Lord have had His fickle friends in mind, when in the parable of the sower He explained how some people, having no "root" in themselves, are scandalized in time of tribulation and persecution, and how others become "fruitless" owing to the "deceitfulness of riches"?

(5) During the course of our lives we too have our Palm Sundays and our Good Fridays, i.e. there are times of triumph and joy, when all goes well with us, and there are times of sorrow and trial. In the former case we, so to speak, wave our palms, but in the latter case we are disposed to throw them away. To do so is foolish, for the palm is the emblem of victory, and victory can and will be ours if we use our tribulations in the right way. During the time of our Good Fridays let us strengthen ourselves with the thought that our Easter Sunday is not far ahead.

P. WALSH.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

MORAL THEOLOGY AND CANON LAW

OWING to the war and its repercussions on the printing and distribution of literature, there is actually very little academic work to comment upon, but in the sphere of movement and action there is a great deal. A series of broadcast talks entitled *The Church Looks Ahead*¹ contains a contribution from Fr. M. C. D'Arcy, S.J., "The Unity Behind Our Differences", giving a brief but excellent definition of what is being sought as a basis of collaboration between non-Catholics and ourselves at the present time. This desired unity rests firstly, on our common humanity; secondly, on the supernatural unity of the Church; and thirdly, on what may be called the residual unity of Christendom, that is to say, the common acceptance of such truths as the sacredness of human life, or the dignity of human nature. Fr. D'Arcy deliberately avoids any direct reference to the Church, an omission which many may think surprising in a book with the above title. But anyone who understands what a Catholic means by "The Church", and who is at the same time anxious to collaborate with non-Catholics, will agree that the omission is extremely wise. For when non-Catholics in this country speak with admiration and reverence of the Church or the Churches they mean something quite different from what Fr. D'Arcy must mean when he uses the word. In a series which aims at reducing differences amongst Christians to the minimum, it is very advisable to refrain from discussing the nature or constitution of the Church, by which of course is meant the one true Church: for no conscientious person can admire or reverence a false or a doubtful one, and no logical thinker could seek unity from the Church's teaching unless he held the Church to be, in some sense or other, one and not many.

Fortunately in writing for this journal one need not be habitually pre-occupied with the outlook, the prejudices and sentiments, or even the manifest virtues of non-Catholics, though God forbid that anything appearing in THE CLERGY REVIEW should give them any just cause of offence. When therefore we use such words as "Church", "Catholic", "Faith", every reader knows what is meant; and when we speak of "Heretic", "Schism", or "Sect", none will suspect us of wishing to insult non-Catholics or to hinder the great cause of the unity of Christendom.

Moreover, in commenting upon the religious co-operation of Catholics with non-Catholics which is so much mooted at the present time, we can do no more than state what the doctrine and law of the Church actually are; whether they ought to be, or can be, something different is not our immediate concern; and in any case we have only to await the guidance of the Bishops if it should become necessary or opportune to modify the existing law and practice. For it may be said with confidence that every Catholic, if it were consistent with his faith, would be only too glad, especially at the present time, to co-operate unreservedly in the religious

¹ Faber & Faber. Pp. 122. 2s. 6d.

activities of his fellow countrymen, people who for the most part acknowledge Christ as their Master and serve Him loyally.

The law against *communicatio in sacris* is briefly contained in Canon 1258, §1: "Haud licitum est fidelibus quovis modo active assistere seu partem habere in sacris acatholicorum." It forbids the faithful to take any active part whatever in the religious worship of non-Catholics, the reason being that such active participation, though not necessarily the profession of heresy, is an external approval of heretical or schismatical worship, and therefore an implied denial, externally at least, of Catholic faith and unity. It is always forbidden, even though there is no scandal, even though there is no internal act of worship, no danger to one's own faith and no internal approval of heresy or schism. The second section of the same canon deals, again very briefly, with passive presence at funerals and similar religious functions, which may be tolerated for adequate reasons provided there is no scandal or danger of perversion: "Tolerari potest praesentia passiva seu mere materialis, civilis officii vel honoris causa, ob gravem rationem ab Episcopo in casu dubii probandam, in acatholicorum funeribus, nuptiis similibusque sollemniis, dummodo perversionis et scandali periculum absit." All the clergy are familiar with the maze of tortuous casuistry born of this toleration, and the phrase *dummodo, etc.*, has almost ceased to have any meaning: it is indulgently assumed that there is never any danger. But when we hear of someone who favours Catholics joining in non-Catholic worship, e.g. by taking part in the prayers or hymns, on the ground that there is no difference between this and attending a funeral, we begin to see the force of the clause *dummodo, etc.* Passive presence at a funeral is indeed permitted by §2 of the canon. But a Catholic may never join actively in the prayers at such a function; any active part ("quovis modo") is absolutely ruled out by §1; and the faithful who are unable to perceive this distinction should never attend any non-Catholic function since in their case there is definitely danger of scandal or perversion.

But could it not be said that a united corporate act, in which no particular body takes the lead, is not forbidden by the law against *communicatio in sacris*, since the service is not that of a non-Catholic sect but is merely one which unites the worshippers on a basis which all share in common? The answer must be that the only kind of public corporate worship in which Catholics may take an active part is that which is indisputably Catholic worship. For any corporate act of religion, united public prayer for example, presupposes that those who join therein share a common religious faith or conviction, which could only mean that, in spite of the unhappy divisions of Christendom, there are a few simple and fundamental doctrines (such as the divinity of Christ) which, it is alleged, claim the adherence of all, and therefore provide a basis upon which all may worship God as one body. But this is precisely the contention which the Holy See has consistently and unequivocally rejected, as may be seen in such documents as the Instruction of the Holy Office, 16 September, 1864, addressed to the English Bishops on the "Association for the Promotion of the Union of Christendom",¹ endorsed more recently for America, 4 July, 1919, and again, 8 July, 1927, in connection with "The World

¹ *Fontes*, n. 979. Cf. Ward's *Life of Wiseman*, Vol. II, p. 477 seq. and Purcell's *Life of Manning*, Vol. II, ch. xiii, p. 272 seq.

Conference on Faith and Order" at Lausanne. In the encyclical *Mortalium Animos*, 6 January, 1928, the Fundamentalism on which all these efforts to obtain agreement amongst Christians was based is explicitly condemned. It is a grievously difficult thing for others to understand that the only kind of unity which the Church contemplates is the submission of all separated communities to her authority. The Bishop of Chichester stands out as a theologian who thoroughly appreciates our position with a sympathetic insight which in others is too often lacking; he understands that "the position of the Church of Rome is different from that of any other Christian communion".¹

Some may think that a united act of worship is, or should be, permissible when it is merely incidental to the purpose of the meeting, e.g. when Catholics and non-Catholics meet to discuss some social question. It must be conceded that *communicatio in sacris* does admit of smallness of matter which may sometimes be so slight as to be negligible—*de minimis non curat lex*—and it may often be advisable to leave Catholics in good faith about trifles. In principle, however, a united prayer is a corporate act of worship even in these circumstances, and is subject to the same ruling as any other united religious service.

It was therefore with lively interest that we read in *The Tablet*, 6 December, 1941, on the authority of a Dutch correspondent, that a rather different outlook existed in Holland. "A remarkable example of collaboration revealed itself when the Calvinist parson, Hasper, compiled a selection of psalms and hymns for common use of Catholics and Protestants. The selection received the 'imprimatur' of the Church! At Groningen Catholics with their Dean and many priests attended in 1937, in a Protestant Church, a meeting with Protestants and, led by a Protestant parson, sang from this hymn-book. Against this, however, certain Protestant quarters, who chose to regard it as a 'Jesuit trick', raised objections". If this practice can be justified, many of our foregoing observations on this subject must be regarded as antiquated and obsolete; but even those amongst us who are most strongly in favour of united services may think that the pastor of Groningen in taking his flock to a Protestant church went a bit too far. We have consulted Wouters, whose large *Moral Theology* is the only Dutch one known to us, and find that he not only teaches the common doctrine but that in certain particulars he is rather more strict than some other writers. What we should like to know is the sequel to this adventure at Groningen, for it is hard to believe that there were no objections to the practice from Catholic quarters.

In the past the Holy See, anxious to preserve unsullied the faith of Catholics, has favoured this principle of exclusiveness even in regard to associations, such as labour unions, whose purpose was purely social and terrestrial. In recent times, however, there are several indications that this policy has been modified. Thus in *Sertum Laetitiae*, 1 November, 1939, the Holy Father speaks of being "impelled by charity to invite the co-operation of those whom Mother Church mourns as separated from her communion—a *se divulsos deflet*", and in the fifth peace point, 24 December, 1939, we are reminded that all nations and their rulers "must be guided

¹ *Christianity and World Order*, 1940, p. 115.

by that universal love which is the compendium and most general expression of the Christian ideal, and which therefore may serve as a common ground also for those who have not the blessing of sharing the same faith with us”.

Collaboration with non-Catholics is, therefore, desired by the Holy See, not indeed for the purpose of seeking agreement on a minimum of fundamental revealed doctrine, nor with the idea of communicating with them in religious worship as the outcome of basic agreement, but purely within the sphere of the natural law, particularly in its social applications as taught during the last fifty years in a series of papal encyclicals. It was within these limits that the now famous joint letter to *The Times*, 21 December, 1940, appeared over the signature of His Eminence the Cardinal, together with those of other Christian leaders, inaugurating a new effort towards collaboration between Catholics and non-Catholics, which has been, and will continue to be, most fruitful in results. Speaking at Birmingham, 22 June, 1941, as reported in *The Tablet*, 5 July, His Grace the Apostolic Delegate gave a timely warning: “It seems to me essential,” he said, “that the use of the term *common ground* by the Holy Father should be well understood as having no connection with any surrender of dogmatic principle or with the error of ‘fundamentalism’. Yet while that danger does exist it is certainly not a valid reason for abstaining from common action and from taking our place on that common ground of which the Pope speaks. . . . While dogmatic differences are wide and deep and may remain so for a long space of time, yet the link which binds all children of God in love of the Father and Creator, and of our brethren created by God in the great human family, will enable us to find agreement on the social teaching of the Catholic Church, and in this love of our fellow man we may be led to find a greater harmony in belief.”

E. J. MAHONEY.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

CIVIL MARRIAGE

One hears occasionally of Catholics who make the civil contract first at the registrar's office and proceed immediately to the church for the marriage. Is this permitted or may the Ordinary allow it to be done? (H.)

REPLY

In England this procedure is certainly not permitted, and though, in principle, an Ordinary may allow it to be done, we cannot easily conceive what justifying reason could exist for the practice, since the civil law provides for the civil contract to follow the marriage rite.

(i) In the common law of the Church it is absolutely recognized that the marriages of Catholics should also be civilly valid, and far from objec-

ting to the civil formalities we are all instructed to observe them: "ut sibi (sponsis) liceat hac in re morem legibus gerere, ipsa non abnuente Ecclesia, quae vult atque optat ut in omnes partes salva sint matrimoniorum effecta, et ne quid liberis detrimenti afferatur."¹ In the recent Instruction of the Congregation of the Sacraments parish priests are recommended to question the parties on this point: "An aliquid et quid actui civili ineundo obstat? Id valet pro locis ubi actus civilis auctoritate publica praecipitur: quo casu parochus, inconsulto Ordinario, nuptiis ne assistat, si quid actui civili ineundo obsit, vel alias de eiusdem civilis actus omissione suspicio subsit."² An added reason is, of course, that civil penalties may be incurred by priests who illegally assist at marriages.

(ii) Where the civil law requires the civil contract to precede the marriage *coram Ecclesia*, the Church most unwillingly accepts the situation and tolerates the practice to avoid greater evils. The arrangement is wholly undesirable because it encourages the idea that the religious ceremony is merely an adornment to the contract, instead of being, as it is everywhere since *Ne Temere*, the substantial contract itself. Nevertheless this is the civil law in France, Germany and many other places, and it is often sanctioned by Concordat with the Holy See as it is, for example, in art. 26 of the Concordat with Germany, 10 September, 1933.³ In such places the faithful are usually instructed very carefully as to the meaning of the civil act and the kind of internal consent that should then be given.⁴ Whatever the effects in civil law may be, the parties understand that they are not married until their true matrimonial consent is given before the competent priest and witnesses.

(iii) In England no difficulty arises and no toleration of a previous civil contract is called for because our marriage laws are so framed, since the Act of 1836, precisely with the purpose of meeting religious objections to civil marriage. By contracting a marriage in a registrar's office, instead of procuring the registrar's attendance at the church, a Catholic in this country would be liable, at least, to the penalties of such canons as 2357, §2, 2294, §2, and 1240, §1, 6. The English bishops have, therefore, declared that the religious ceremony of all marriages must take place before the civil formality,⁵ and local legislation frequently repeats this instruction.⁶ Certainly, if the necessity arose, the Ordinary could sanction a departure from the law, it being assumed that all the canonical preliminaries to marriage have been duly observed. If this permission has not been obtained, the case would have to be dealt with like any other of its kind, and the attempted marriage convalidated.

MISSA PRO POPULO

In this diocese the number of Masses to be said has been reduced by papal indult. It is the custom, nevertheless, with the Ordinary's sanction, for those parish priests who desire to say the full number (as prescribed by

¹ Leo xiii, *Arcanum*, 10 February, 1880.

² *A.A.S.*, 1941, xxiii, 312.

³ Cf. *CLERGY REVIEW*, 1941, xx, p. 440 pointing out an error in a popular English version of the text which gives an exactly opposite sense to the article.

⁴ Cf. De Smet, *De Matrimonio*, §462, n. 4.

⁵ Cf. *Leeds Synods*, 1931, p. 102.

⁶ Cf. *Middlesborough Decrees*, 1933, n. 159.

the common law) to supplement their salary from the parish funds. How does this practice harmonize with the reply given in the August, 1941, issue of this journal, page 110? (L.)

REPLY

The principle underlying the reply given in answer to a previous question on this subject is that of Canon 825.2: *Nunquam licet eleemosynam recipere pro Missa quae alio titulo debetur et applicetur*. The Missa pro Populo is due on a title of justice and therefore no stipend may be taken either from the parish funds or from any other source for the application of this Mass.

In the case as explained above this principle remains intact. If a parish priest enjoys an indult permitting him to satisfy his obligation in this respect by saying, let us suppose, twenty Masses annually for the people instead of the full number required by the common law, it follows that he is not bound on a title of justice to say Mass for them on those days on which the obligation has been extinguished. He is, therefore, free to accept a stipend on those days. As the administrator of the parochial funds, and with the Ordinary's sanction, he takes the appropriate stipend from the funds which he controls.

Or, if desired, the matter may be regarded from another point of view: the constitution of an English benefice being, at the moment, rather vaguely determined, it is for the Ordinary to fix it in terms of a salary due to the parish priest from the parochial funds which he administers. The additional sum taken in the above circumstances is then to be regarded as legitimate beneficial fruits, namely, a certain number of Mass stipends due to the beneficiary and to be applied for the people, though not technically *Missae pro Populo*.

NOVEMBER MASSES

(1) Is it permitted to say a novena of Masses for the intentions of those who, at the priest's invitation, send in names of the deceased together with whatever offering they care to make?

(2) If local legislation forbids this practice and requires the number of Masses to correspond exactly with the diocesan stipend, what are the obligations of a priest who, in ignorance of the legislation, has disregarded it? (S.)

REPLY

Canon 830: *Si quis pecuniae summam obtulerit pro Missarum applicatione, non indicans earundem numerum, hic supputetur secundum eleemosynam loci in quo oblator morabatur, nisi aliam fuisse eius intentionem legitime praesumi debeat*.

Canon 832: *Sacerdoti fas est oblatam ultro maiorem stipem pro Missae applicatione accipere et, nisi loci Ordinarius prohibuerit, etiam minorem*.

(1) From these canons and from many other legal texts it is certain

that a priest may lawfully accept as Mass offerings a sum which is not the usual diocesan stipend. It is a recognized method of supporting the clergy who are entitled to live by the altar they serve, and there is a decision *S.C. Concilii*, 16 January, 1649, reversing an episcopal injunction which prohibited the acceptance of offerings in excess of the diocesan stipend.¹ But it is always necessary to establish that the intention of the donor was to give a larger sum. If there is no local law to the contrary, the practice described by our correspondent is lawful, provided a novena of Masses is said no matter what the collective offering may be: if it is less than the diocesan stipend the Ordinary's sanction is required as in Canon 832, or where the custom of November Masses exists it may be presumed as in Canon 831, §2. It is evident, from the circumstances, that in November Masses the donors agree to offer a wholly indeterminate sum. Smith in *Ecclesiastical Law*, Vol. I, p. 532, quotes for America a decision—*S.C. Concilii*, 27 January, 1877, which expressly sanctions the custom of saying one Mass for an indeterminate collective offering, it being understood that the donors so desire: “. . . tantum apponatur tabella in ecclesia, qua fideles doceantur, quod illis ipsis eleemosynis una canitur Missa in di Commemorationis omnium fidelium defunctorum.”

(ii) The practice is liable to abuse, for although it is open to any of the faithful to have whatever Masses they desire said according to the diocesan stipend and to disregard the collective offering, many may be under the impression that the offerings over and above those destined for the Novena will be applied to additional Masses according to the diocesan stipend. Therefore, in many dioceses, the indeterminate collective Mass offering, whether during November or at any other time, is forbidden, and the clergy are required to say the number of Masses which strictly corresponds to the diocesan stipend. A regulation of this kind is within the competence of the local Ordinary, and its non-observance appears to be a violation of Canon 825.3: *nunquam licet duplicem eleemosynam pro eiusdem Missae applicatione accipere*. *S.C. Concilii*, 16 January, 1649, refers not to these indeterminate collective offerings but to manual stipends in the ordinary sense of the term. The reply of 27 January, 1877, was for the diocese of Rochester sanctioning the local custom.

If a priest is ignorant of the law which, as our correspondent states, has been promulgated in the diocesan synod, the common opinion would be that it is culpable ignorance. Whether it is or not, he is bound, in our opinion, to say or get said for all former offerings received a number of Masses corresponding to the diocesan stipend, and if this is a morally impossible burden his only remedy is to seek condonation from the Holy See. This may appear a rather strict solution, but the legislation on Mass offerings is extremely strict and can be enforced by grave penalties as in Canon 2324.

GENERAL ABSOLUTION

Is a general absolution valid if given by a priest in the presbytery to all the Catholics of a town in their homes, or wherever they may be, at the beginning of an air-raid? (L. W. F.)

¹ *Fontes*, n 2691.

REPLY

(i) A general absolution to be valid must conform to the requirements of this sacrament *jure divino*, which are all contained within the teaching of the Church in the Council of Trent, Sess. XIV, Can. 9, that priestly absolution is a judicial act. The essentials of this act, as well as the conditions for the valid reception of any sacrament, are certainly observed when a general absolution is given to a regiment or to a church full of people: (a) the penitents have the requisite intention and manifest it externally by reciting the act of contrition; (b) the judicial sentence is pronounced by the priest in the words of absolution, after reminding the people, as ordered by the Holy See,¹ that the absolution is of no avail unless they are rightly disposed and that an integral confession of their sins must be made on a future occasion; (c) the recipients are present at this judgement.

(ii) In the circumstances of the above question the faithful could be previously instructed to form an intention and make an act of contrition immediately the sirens sound. At the same moment the priest could pronounce the words of absolution, having previously instructed the people on the conditions attached to its reception, thus securing some degree of simultaneity between the matter and form of the sacrament.

If, in addition, it could be said that the recipients are, in some probable sense of the word, present at the priestly absolution, it would follow that the act is probably valid and therefore permissible at least conditionally. It is under this aspect of the matter that many disputed questions have been, and still are, discussed: absolution by letter is invalid; by telephone extremely doubtful; pronounced over one who has precipitately left the confessional, it will depend on the distance. Whether examined on theological principles or subjected to a tiresome casuistical method, a correct solution of all these questions turns on establishing the presence or absence of the penitent at the moment of absolution.

If it were merely a matter of ecclesiastical law, as in the absolution of censures and other penalties, the judgement could validly be given in a variety of ways: by letter, messenger, telephone, telegraph or wireless. Nor is there anything in the nature of a judicial sentence which necessarily requires the presence of the penitent at the moment of absolution. This is required in the sacramental absolution of sin because, from the teaching of the Church, Christ has willed that the judgement shall be given in words and words alone: "Docet . . . sacramenti poenitentiae formam, in qua praecipue ipsius vis sita est, in illis ministri verbis positam esse: *Ego te absolvo etc.*" "Forma huius sacramenti sunt verba absolutionis."²

This verbal form, in which the penitent is mentioned by the personal pronoun, necessarily implies that he is present when it is uttered, and the theologians, therefore, restrict their discussions to determining the outside limit of distance within which "presence" is verified. They write,

¹ 8 December, 1939; CLERGY REVIEW, 1940, XVIII, p. 306.

² Trent and Florence: Denz. 896, 699; Cf. also the judgement of Clement VIII on absolution by letter: Denz. 1088.

indeed, of moral presence, but we agree with Chrétien,¹ that physical presence would better express their meaning; a person would be morally present in his deputy or proxy, which is clearly insufficient. It may be held, with St. Alphonsus, that penitents are present if they can be seen by the priest,² but it accords better with the vocal form if we require the voice of the priest to be heard. Thus a well-established probabilist like Noldin advises that, in giving general absolution to an army, the men should be divided and absolved in separate groups if some are too far distant to hear the priest's voice.³

We cannot find any writer who expressly deals with the above question, and the editor would welcome any arguments proving that these scattered penitents may be considered present. It could be maintained, we suppose, that they are present as a body of parishioners. But in country districts the parishioners might be spread over a vast territory, and if these can be absolved, why not the whole diocese or the whole nation. Since we can find nothing to justify the view that penitents in these circumstances may validly be absolved, nor even a probability in its favour, it is our opinion that absolution may not lawfully be given even conditionally. Cf. writers *De Poenitentia*: de modo proferendi absolutionem, e.g. Cappello, II, §92; Marc-Gestermann, II, §1663.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

(i) ALLOCUTIO

Summus Pontifex, die 3 mensis Octobris a. 1941, adstantibus Praelatis Auditoribus ceterisque officialibus et administris Tribunalis Sacrae Romanae Rotae necnon eiusdem Tribunalis Advocatis et Procuratoribus haec verba fecit (A.A.S., 1941, XXXIII, pp. 421-6).

. (Introduction omitted).

It is well known in what high estimation the decisions of your Tribunal are held by other ecclesiastical tribunals, as well as by moralists and jurists. But the greater the authority it enjoys the more strictly is the Roman Rota bound to the scrupulous observance and faithful interpretation of the directives of law according to the mind of the Roman Pontiff, under whose eyes it discharges its proper function as the instrument and organ of the Holy See itself. And if this holds in regard to any matter with which it deals, it holds particularly in regard to the matrimonial cases—numerous as ever—on which your illustrious Dean has just delivered his statement, and the correct solution of which serves in the best way possible not only to safeguard the sanctity and stability of marriage, but also to protect the

¹ *De Poenitentia*, p. 116, note 17.

² *De Sacramentis* (1935), §238, c.

³ *Theol. Moralis*, VI, n. 429.

natural right of the faithful, having due regard to the common good of human society and the private good of individuals.

(1) And first as to *the right to marry*. Our glorious Predecessors, Leo XIII and Pius XI, have taught that "no human law can deprive man of the natural and primordial right to marry". This right, since it was given to man immediately by the Author of nature, the supreme Lawgiver, cannot be denied to anyone unless it is proved either that he has voluntarily renounced it or else that through some mental or bodily defect he is incapable of contracting matrimony. But in order that in particular cases a contemplated marriage may be prevented or a contracted marriage declared void, this antecedent and perpetual impotence must be established not merely in a doubtful or probable manner but with moral certainty; and in the event of such certainty, the contemplated marriage cannot be allowed nor can the contracted marriage be said to be valid.

Cases involving this impotence, whether psychical (i.e. mental) or physical—cases of their nature very delicate and often very complicated—are frequently brought before the Roman Rota; and it is to the credit and glory of that Tribunal that it has dealt with them with the greatest care and impartiality.

Psychical impotence, based upon a pathological defect, has recently been dealt with by the Roman Rota; and in this connection the judicial sentence had occasion to bring into evidence certain theories advanced as the latest discoveries in modern psychiatry and psychology. This is praiseworthy and gives proof of wide and careful research; ecclesiastical jurisprudence cannot and ought not to neglect the true progress of those sciences that touch matters of morality and law; nor is it either right or fitting to repudiate theories on the sole ground that they are new. Are we to say that novelty is the enemy of science? If it takes no new steps beyond the truth already acquired, how is human knowledge to make any progress in the great field of nature? Nevertheless close scrutiny and careful consideration are necessary to make sure that new theories are indeed true science, i.e. established by adequate experiment and proof, and not merely vague hypotheses devoid of positive and solid argument. For in this latter case they cannot form the basis of a safe judgement, i.e. a judgement which excludes all reasonable doubt.

Physical impotence also has frequently been the subject of decisions of the Roman Rota. This too is a delicate and difficult question, in which two tendencies are to be avoided: first the tendency which, in examining the elements which constitute the act of generation, considers only the primary purpose of matrimony, as though the secondary purpose did not exist or at any rate were not a *finis operis* established by the Creator of nature Himself; and secondly, the tendency to regard the secondary purpose as equally important, and to divorce it from its essential subordination to the primary purpose, a course which of logical necessity would lead to lamentable consequences. In other words, if truth stands in the middle two excesses are to be avoided: on the one hand practically to deny or unduly to depreciate the secondary purpose of matrimony and of the act of generation; on the other, to dissociate or separate unduly the conjugal act from the primary purpose for which by the whole of its intrinsic structure it is primarily and principally intended.

(2) As for *declarations of nullity*, it is well known how cautious and discouraging the Church is in regard to them. If it is true that the tranquillity, the stability and the security of human relations in general require that contracts should not lightly be declared null and void, this holds still more in the case of a contract so important as that of matrimony. The firmness and stability of this contract are demanded by the common good of human society and by the individual good of the married parties and their offspring; moreover the dignity of the Sacrament forbids that which is sacred and sacramental to be lightly exposed to the danger of profanation. Furthermore we all know that human hearts are often only too prone to seek release from a matrimonial bond which they have contracted, either because of some inconvenience or through mutual disagreement or boredom, or with a view to union with another person sinfully desired. Consequently the ecclesiastical judge should not show himself too ready to declare the nullity of a marriage, but rather should do everything possible to bring about the revalidation of a marriage invalidly contracted, especially when the circumstances of the case render this particularly advisable.

If, however, revalidation proves impossible, either through the presence of an impediment in which the Church cannot or is not accustomed to dispense, or through the refusal of the parties to give or renew their consent, then the sentence of nullity cannot be refused to anyone who justly and legitimately demands it according to the rules of canon law, on condition that the alleged invalidity is established—understanding as being *established* that which is ascertained with *moral* certainty, i.e. with a certainty excluding all reasonable doubt, or based upon positive reasons. It is impossible to require *absolute* certainty, i.e. a certainty which excludes not only all positive probability of the contrary but even all possibility of it. The legal principle according to which “*matrimonium gaudet favore juris; quare in dubio standum est pro valore matrimonii, donec contrarium probetur*” (Can. 1014), is to be understood only in the sense that the contrary must be proved with moral certainty. No ecclesiastical tribunal has the right or the power to require more. To require more may easily lead to violating the strict right of the suitors in a matrimonial case, since, if they are not in reality bound by any matrimonial bond, they have the natural right to contract one.

(3) Finally, in regard to the *dissolution of the bond* validly contracted, the Roman Rota is sometimes called upon to examine whether all the necessary preliminaries have been fulfilled which are required for a valid and licit dissolution of the bond and whether, in consequence, the Sovereign Pontiff may be advised to grant the appropriate release.

These pre-requisites relate above all to the question whether the marriage is in itself dissoluble. Although a juridical Tribunal such as yours needs no reminding, yet it is not irrelevant to our discourse to recall that a ratified and consummated marriage is by divine law indissoluble, inasmuch as it is unable to be dissolved by any human power (Can. 1118); whereas other marriages, though intrinsically indissoluble, do not possess an absolute extrinsic indissolubility, but given certain necessary pre-requisites can (in cases which are of course relatively rare), even outside the case of the Pauline privilege, be dissolved by the Roman Pontiff in virtue of his ministerial power.

When we say that the ecclesiastical judge is called upon to establish the existence of these pre-requisites, you understand at once that the importance of the matter requires such an investigation to be conducted with all strictness, rigour and care; the more so because, involving as it does the use of vicarious power in a matter *de jure divino*, the validity of the dissolution of the bond depends upon the existence of the necessary pre-requisites. Moreover, in all cases and in every stage of the process the rules imposed by Christian modesty in so delicate a matter must be fully and strictly observed.

Here also, clearly, the same principle holds true: moral certainty, excluding all reasonable doubt, suffices. It is true that nowadays, when contempt and neglect of religion have caused the revival of a new pagan spirit, pleasure-loving and impatient of restraint, we find in certain parts of the world a mania for divorce such that people tend to make and unmake marriages with an ease and a lightheartedness which they would eschew in an ordinary contract of hire. But this mania, thoughtless and irrational, cannot be regarded by ecclesiastical tribunals as a reason for departing from the norms and practice which are dictated and approved by a sound judgement and a God-fearing conscience. For the indissolubility or dissolubility of marriage the only norm and practice which can hold for the Church is that which God, the Author of nature and grace, has established.

In this connection there are two passages of Sacred Scripture which in some manner indicate the limits within which the dissolution of the bond must remain, excluding both the lax attitude of the present day and that rigorism which is contrary to the divine will and command. One is: "What God hath joined together let no man put asunder" (Matt. xix, 6); that is to say, not man, but God alone can put asunder the married parties, and therefore there is no sundering where God does not dissolve the bond. The other is: "A brother or sister is not under servitude . . . : but God hath called us in peace" (1 Cor. vii, 15); that is to say, there is no longer any servitude or bond where God dissolves it and thus allows the married person licitly to marry again. In every case the supreme norm according to which the Roman Pontiff uses his vicarious power to dissolve marriages is the same which guides the whole exercise of the judiciary power of the Church: the Salvation of Souls. In the attainment of this end the common good of the Church, that of human relations in general, and the private benefit of individuals receive alike due and proportionate consideration.¹

. (Conclusion omitted).

ad 1. The papal teaching on the right to marry, which may be read in *Casti Connubii* (C.T.S., p. 5), quoting Leo XIII's *Arcanum*, was the point raised in a recent letter to this journal, December, 1941, p. 372. The encyclicals insist on the power of the Church to control the marriage of Christians, e.g. by instituting impediments, and any definition of marriage must contain the words "inter personas habiles". A man's subjective right to marry is therefore limited in his choice of a partner to those persons who are not excluded by just marriage laws, whether natural or positive. The subjective right itself must be denied to those who are absolutely

¹ English translation from the Italian by G.D.S.

impotent as defined in Canon 1068, §1: "Impotentia antecedens et perpetua, sive ex parte viri sive ex parte mulieris, sive alteri cognita sive non, sive absoluta sive relativa, matrimonium ipso naturae iure dirimit." The type of impotence, usually relative, described by the older canonists as "frigidity" or "vaginismus", is recognized by contemporaries as often due to psychical causes. Cf. for example an article by a neurologist in *Apollinaris*, 1938, p. 377. The Rota, it appears, has in the past been loth to admit this as canonical impotence because its perpetuity has been difficult to establish with moral certainty, but a clearer scientific understanding of its causes has removed the objection. We have not seen the judgements to which the Holy Father refers; they are not printed till ten years have elapsed.

ad 2. The Holy Father's insistence, throughout this discourse, on the right of suitors in marriage causes to a favourable verdict, if the cause of nullity is established with moral certainty, is very timely. It is a right which may properly be exercised even at the risk of giving offence to certain non-Catholics, who are sometimes difficult to please: "we have piped to you and you have not danced, we have lamented and you have not mourned": their disgust with the Church for not permitting divorce is only equalled by their fury at ecclesiastical declarations of nullity.

ad 3. Between two baptized persons the bond of marriage validly contracted and subsequently consummated is dissolved only by death. Unions which fall short of this required status and condition may be dissolved by the Sovereign Pontiff. The pre-requisites of which the Holy Father speaks are, in the case of non-consummated marriages, clearly formulated in the two series of *normae* issued by S.C. de *Disciplina Sacramentorum*, 7 May, 1923, and 27 March, 1929. Of greater interest, perhaps, is the more rarely used papal power of dissolving, in given circumstances, the consummated marriage of parties one of whom is not baptized. Great prominence was given to a case of this kind in 1925 and the papal power is clearly formulated in the English translation of Gasparri's Catechism, p. 193. Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, 1932, IV, p. 503; 1940, XVIII, p. 263. The essential pre-requisites *sine qua non* are proof of non-baptism of one of the parties, or proof of non-consummation subsequent to the baptism of this party.

E. J. M.

(ii) EPISTULA

Ad Praesidem, Doctores et Alumnos Studiorum Universitatis "Fordham" in Civitate Neo-Eboracensi: Primo Saeculo ab Eius Ortu Exeunte (A.A.S., 1941, XXXIII, p. 328).

PIUS PP. XII

It is with heartfelt affection that We join with the Maryland-New York Province of the Society of Jesus and with the directors, professors, students and friends of Fordham University in the Centenary celebrations of that magnificent institution. And Our paternal joy is, indeed, deepened and made more intimate by the thought that We are numbered amongst your

alumni and by the happy recollection of Our visit with you some years ago, when We had occasion to see with Our own eyes the evidence of your outstanding accomplishments for God and Country. As Vicar of Christ upon earth, and as Guardian of His precious heritage to mankind, We have still further reason for rejoicing with you on this auspicious occasion, because throughout the hundred years of Fordham University's history its directors and professors have fostered and encouraged, with undeniable success, the principles of Christian education upon which the University was founded and without which all education is barren and must constitute a menace to society as well as to the individual.

We are well aware of the development which, under God's Providence and by His divine favour, has marked the history of Fordham University. From a very humble beginning, with five students, it has expanded and grown until it now boasts an enrolment of approximately eight thousand students; many beautiful buildings have been added to the original Manor House; and the first college and ecclesiastical seminary have become a complete university that may justly take its place with the great universities of the United States. But this material progress, this increase in numbers and facilities, in a land where educational institutions have flourished, might easily be passed over were it not accompanied by the zealous and eminently successful efforts of the loyal sons of St. Ignatius to instil in the minds of the Catholic youth entrusted to their care the principles of sound philosophy and revealed truth which are the birthright of Christian education.

We are greatly consoled, in the midst of the sorrows which afflict Our Apostolic heart, by the thought of the many thousands of students who have gone forth from Fordham University, carefully trained in the secular sciences and arts, deeply imbued with the principles of the Faith, and ready and eager, both in mind and in heart, to defend the Kingdom of God, to contribute generously to the advancement of Christian civilization and to live at peace with their fellow men. And it is Our confident and prayerful hope that all those who in the future will partake of the rare privileges and bounteous advantages offered by your University may be even more fully prepared to encounter with courage and conviction the difficulties and the perils which await them and which seem likely to be very greatly accentuated in the troublous times which may lie ahead. Thus your alumni will continue to be a very definite asset to the great country to which they owe allegiance and a source of joy and consolation to their Church and to their University.

Among the names of the distinguished and illustrious men who have been closely associated with the history and tradition of Fordham University are to be found those of your courageous founder, John Hughes, first Archbishop of New York, and John Cardinal McCloskey, your first president; from your alumni records one might cite the names of numerous bishops and priests, justices and lawyers, writers and orators, civil and ecclesiastical leaders who by their eminent accomplishments have brought

fame and repute to the University. On this happy occasion of the Centenary you may, indeed, proudly honour the memory of those courageous men who played so important a rôle in the history of your school and of those outstanding graduates who should be a continual source of joy and inspiration—the joy that derives from glorious achievement and the inspiration that leads to future progress. But while paying due honour to those illustrious men of the past and present, We would add a word of praise and gratitude for that other success achieved by countless thousands who have gone forth from the hallowed halls of your institution to bring prestige to their Alma Mater in their own quiet way, without personal fame or renown, by demonstrating in a very practical manner that as graduates of a Catholic University they are worthy Christian citizens rendering valuable service to both Church and State. It was, indeed, to insure that every student would be fully trained to play that important, though perhaps obscure, part in the drama of life that your University was founded and it is for that same end that its directors are striving so earnestly and so capably today.

Speaking some years ago to the large gathering of friends and students who had assembled on the campus to welcome Us to your University, We reminded you that your future is rich in promise because you cherish the priceless inheritance of the past; and in urging you to be true to the traditions, the principles, the ideals of Fordham, We assured you that in doing so you would not only be serving God and Country, but that you would likewise be meriting for yourselves an incorruptible crown which would be yours for all eternity. Those sentiments and exhortations were expressed in anticipation of your Centenary. We renew them, with heartfelt meaning, now that the Centenary is actually being commemorated. And, in extending Our paternal felicitations on this happy occasion, We earnestly pray that Fordham University may continue the loyalty and devotedness, the sacrifices and the labours that have marked its glorious past, and that Almighty God in His infinite Wisdom may enlighten the way to a still more glorious future.

In testimony of Our paternal affection and as a pledge that divine light may be vouchsafed you in abundant measure, from Our heart We impart to you Our Apostolic Benediction.

Given at the Vatican this twenty-fourth day of February in the year of Our Lord nineteen hundred and forty-one.

PIUS PP. XII

CHURCH MANAGEMENT

EVENING SERVICE

THE arrangement of the Evening Service often presents a difficult problem to the priest who finds it necessary to stimulate the flagging interest of his congregation. If the writer of these lines ventures to put forward a few considerations on the subject it is chiefly in the hope that they may prompt other readers of THE CLERGY REVIEW to submit further suggestions of their own.

On the assumption that the Evening Service is to take the form of Rosary, Sermon and Benediction, it is possible to introduce certain variations which may tend to brighten the service and keep the congregation alert. In the recitation of the Rosary there is no law obliging the priest to say the first part of each Pater, Ave and Gloria and the congregation the second. The gospel side of the church might alternate with the epistle side in reciting the first and second parts, a further variation being provided in the third decade which could be recited by all together. In some places the congregation is asked to stand for the second and fourth mysteries. This, perhaps, savours too much of the parade ground; but it has the advantage of keeping the people wide awake, while at the same time relieving the strain on their knees. Variety can also be obtained by the singing of a part of the Rosary. It lengthens the proceedings somewhat to sing a whole decade, or even each Pater and Gloria. But the Gloria at least might be sung. Slight alterations such as these, varied from week to week, would lessen the monotony of what is apt to become a dull and spiritually unprofitable devotion.

Moreover, experience shows that the people like to be given a definite intention for which to offer up each decade. Such intentions are not difficult to supply in these days when so many have been killed or are in danger of death, to say nothing of refugees, evacuees, hostages and prisoners of war.

With regard to the Sermon two things might be kept in mind: to make it interesting, and to keep it on the short side. The modern mind seems to be incapable of prolonged concentration. One must endeavour first to arouse interest and then to sustain it. Gone are the days when people revelled in long sermons, hanging on every word as it fell from the speaker's lips. "Short and snappy" is the rule today. It has been said that it is impossible to hold the interest of a modern congregation for more than ten minutes. This is perhaps an exaggeration, but one suspects that most congregations find their attention lapsing after fifteen or twenty minutes. In any case, if you outrun your time in preaching you will have to compress the Benediction, which is undesirable, or else prolong the Service beyond the hour, which is more undesirable still.

In England the Benediction Service is more or less standardized, yet it admits of minor modifications which add to the interest of the faithful. Thus the choir might sing the first verse of the *O Salutaris* and *Tantum Ergo* in four-part harmony, and the choir with the congregation sing the second verse in unison. Again, is it necessary to sing the Litany of Loretto every

Sunday? Of course, if the Ordinary has prescribed it there is no choice in the matter. But in the absence of such order, could not the Litany be recited in English after the Rosary and a hymn to the Blessed Sacrament, preferably in English, be sung after the O *Salutaris*? (Incidentally, while hymns of the New Westminster Hymnal are allowed in the vernacular *coram Sanctissimo*?) At certain seasons of the year a Latin hymn would be appropriate, e.g. the "Adeste" at Christmastide, the "Haec dies" at Easter, the "Veni Creator Spiritus" at Pentecost.

Occasionally, the Divine Praises might be sung instead of being said, and now and again a hymn substituted for the *Adoremus*. If any English hymn is sung it must not begin until the tabernacle has been closed. The *Adoremus* without the psalm gives the priest just enough time to replace the Blessed Sacrament in the tabernacle. There are many hymns suitable for the conclusion of the Benediction Service; and "Faith of our Fathers" on the second Sunday of the month provides a very fitting finish to the Benediction for the Conversion of England.

W. P. S.

BOOK REVIEW

Talking at Random. By Douglas Woodruff. (Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. Pp. 145. 7s. 6d. net.)

REGULAR readers of *The Tablet*, who are accustomed to make a solid meal out of it, often reverse the order on the menu and prefer their *Talking at Random* as hors d'œuvres rather than as dessert. Herein they show considerable good taste and they will all be delighted to possess this small little volume containing the author's own choice of morsels. It is no easy fare to provide each week, since in a religious journal one expects meals to be not only decorous but always of a theological or ecclesiastical flavor as well as doctrinally sound. For example, the indissolubility of marriage is maintained when we hear of Mrs. Dodge Godde getting a divorce in Reno; and the Chinese title for "The Merry Widow", which is "He died—she glad", endorses the doctrine of all the moral theologians that it is permitted to rejoice over the second effect of a person's death.

The extracts are not arranged in any particular order, and it must be remembered that the title at the head of each page does not necessarily refer to the words immediately beneath, though sometimes the connection is most apt. Thus it would appear on page 124 that "Brighten up the tongue" is a thought which follows naturally from thinking about ministers of religion, whereas the title actually belongs to the subsequent section on methods of business publicity.

The author records his pleasure at hearing the sermon preached in church place before instead of after the reading of the epistle and gospel: the method avoided anticlimax and was effective in creating expectancy. Unless there exists some local regulation on the order to be observed, we can see no reason why this practice, which has so much to recommend it, should not be more widely adopted.

The book closes with the text of the war prophecy attributed to the Odile, and many will be glad to have it in this permanent form.

E. J. M.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE DEFENCE OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION

(CLERGY REVIEW, 1941, XXI, p. 316)

the Rev. Ailbe J. Luddy, O.Cist., writes :

I have read with much interest Dr. Davis' article on the Immaculate Conception. It is a satisfaction to see the illustrious Eadmer getting the recognition due to him. But the writer's account of the controversy between Nicholas of St. Albans and Peter of Celles (who, by the way, was certainly not a Cistercian) puzzles me more than a little. Dr. Davis represents the latter as "correcting his English friend in his ill-advised support of a doctrine which has no tradition behind it", i.e. the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. But Peter was himself an enthusiastic supporter of that doctrine. Thus, in his second reply to Nicholas, he writes : "Credo, dico, assero et juro beatissimam Virginem nostram in aeterna praedestinatione singulari privilegio munitam, nec a sua Conceptione in aliquo vicio, sed semper mansisse et permansisse illibatam" (P.L., CCII, 628). I have searched in vain for anything like such a confession of faith on the part of Nicholas. All that I can gather from his epistle to Peter and from the latter's reply is that Nicholas condemned St. Bernard for his opposition to the Feast of the Conception and maintained that Mary was immune from the motions of concupiscence. He actually seems to make her sinless conception to consist in this immunity "ante duodennatum ex naturae beneficio, post duodennatum ex gratiae dono". Hence he asks : "Quae derogativae distinctio inter singularem Virginem et alias sanctas virgines peccatum sensit ut aliae, sed non consensit sicut nec aliae ?" (P.L., CCII, 66). That is to say, in his view, freedom from the stings of concupiscence alone distinguished the Mother of God from other holy virgins.

Dr. Davis tells us that the silly story of Bernard's purgatorial expiation was widely known before Nicholas related it. But Nicholas himself claims the credit of putting it into circulation. The monk to whom the Saint appeared with the request to publish his dishonour, seeing the abbots inclined to hush the matter up, had recourse surreptitiously to Nicholas : "igitur, si ego publico quod ipse (Bernardus) publicari voluit, hoc non est ut famam extenuare."

It may be added that some reputable authors, as Manriquez, have identified Nicholas of St. Albans with Nicholas of Clairvaux, the infamous impostor and forger.

In the passage quoted above from Peter of Celles it is just possible that he may be speaking of the Conception *qua Ipsa Virgo concepit*, but that would not make the position of Nicholas any the more orthodox.

If Dr. Davis can convince me that Nicholas was really a genuine champion of the Immaculate Conception I shall have much to thank him for and much also to retract.

Dr. Davis replies :

I am grateful to Fr. Luddy for taking interest in my article and for having pointed out two slips in it. I was misled into thinking that

Peter of Cellés was a Cistercian by his defence of St. Bernard, whom I refer to as the reformer of his Order. Moreover, a re-reading of Nicholas's letter convinces me that Fr. Luddy is right in saying that Nicholas claims the credit of publishing the story of St. Bernard's apparition.

But on the main issue—i.e. the opinion of Nicholas about the conception of Our Lady—I am unable to follow Fr. Luddy's arguments. Consideration of the external evidence removes any shadow of doubt that I may have had regarding Nicholas' views. Fr. le Bachelet (*D.T.* VII, 1023-4) quotes J. Pitseus, *Relationum historicarum de rebus anglicis tomus primus* (Paris, 1619), as stating that about 1140 Nicholas of St. Alban defended the doctrine that Our Lady was conceived without sin. Wood's *Historia et Antiquitates Univ. Oxon.*, mentions the same Nicholas of St. Alban as one of those who discussed the Conception of Our Lady and other matters at Oxford about the year 1144. The first of the above sources informs us further that Nicholas later published two works on the subject, which he dedicated to Hugh of St. Victor. One of these would appear to be the Oxford manuscript entitled *Liber Magistri Nicolai de celebratione conceptione beate Marie contra beatum Bernhardum*. The first of Peter of Cellés's letters is probably an answer to one of these works; and in it the principal point of discussion is clearly the doctrine of Mary's Conception.

In his letter Peter regrets that the authority of the truth and the judgment of a general council have never passed a verdict of approval on, or propagated the doctrine of, the Virgin's immaculate conception. Failing such approval, it remains a pious presumption: "*Tolerabilis praesumptio, sed non satis probabilis. Abstinere certe ab omni praesumptione volo.*" He would never, he says, have bothered about it if Nicholas had not asserted that Mary's soul was transfixed not only in the Passion of her Son but also when people attack her conception. This is a stumbling block to Peter, who cannot see how the Virgin can suffer now that she is in heaven. Moreover, he protests that the Virgin cannot be honoured by an attack on her great devotee, St. Bernard. So far the subject of discussion is evidently the Conception of Our Lady. He now goes on, clearly as an afterthought, to introduce the question of Mary's immunity from concupiscence. "Your scale of values," he writes, "seems also to err . . . in that you say that this singular Virgin conquered all sin, not by fighting it, but by not even feeling it." In Peter's view Mary was subject to concupiscence, at least until the time of the Annunciation, and he quotes St. Jerome in favour of this opinion.

Peter having transferred the discussion from the main issue of the Conception of Mary to this latter point, Nicholas in his reply naturally devotes special attention to it. "Behold my Peter," he writes, "stirs up a new battle in a new and quite unexpected quarter, and provokes the indignation of all the Virgin's household . . ." In holding that Mary was immune from concupiscence even before the Annunciation Nicholas claims to be holding no more than St. Bernard held, since even he admitted that Our Lady was sanctified before her birth. Unless we grant at least this immunity to Our Lady, he says, she would be no better than any other holy virgin.

I will not develop Nicholas' argument any further; but the internal evidence of his letter to Peter agrees quite fully with the external evidence

showing that the main point at issue was the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, which Nicholas defended.

I do not think any credit can be given to the suggestion of the Cistercian Annals which identifies Nicholas of St. Albans with the apostate. The former was discussing these questions at Oxford long before his name—like even joined Clairvaux, and still longer before he apostatized. Moreover, the apostate had met Peter of Celles personally, whereas Peter regrets at a much later date that he had never had the pleasure of meeting Nicholas face to face. It is understandable that those opposing Nicholas of St. Albans four or five centuries later should have attempted to discredit him by suggesting his possible identity with the apostate forger.

CATHOLIC ACTION

(CLERGY REVIEW, 1941, XXI, p. 320)

Mr. William Park writes:

I have heard several priests comment enthusiastically on Fr. Appleby's article on Catholic Action, either because it satisfied them to think of it simply as the aid of lay apostles in performing their pastoral work, or because they were already ardent supporters of the Legion of Mary.

This in one sense is all to the good. An apologia for the Legion of Mary under the guise of an all-embracing article on Catholic Action is welcome propaganda for that excellent institution. It is, however, an over-simplification of a very urgent issue and historically somewhat misleading.

How are we to affect the life of the nation? With a profound message to deliver, sure of our ground amidst a morass of doubt and uncertainty, full of eagerness to impart our own convictions, we pass almost unnoticed. We have not even attained the stage of a nuisance value. A similar situation on the Continent led them to evolve and eventually unite in one supreme organization various groups with aims of their own to influence their own particular environment—the factory worker the factory, the professional man the profession. This meant not only that the organization was non-parochial in its structure, but also that its field of activity was its own milieu rather than the parish. Parochial schemes were of course evolved too, but until the trouble between the Italian Government and the Azione Cattolica (it had acquired so much influence!) began, it is hard to say that Catholic Action abroad was more non-parochial than parochial.

That we have need of something similar is surely beyond doubt. The parochial activity of the Legion of Mary may indeed be the real long-term policy. Until we sanctify our parishes, our influence over the life of our environment will be small. But this is not enough. We have to answer our critics who say that we make no impression whatever on the life of the nation with concerted action.

Alas! Here is where the vagueness and intangibility of the whole movement as at present constituted becomes painfully felt. It is not pessimism but merely facing facts to say that the total effect of Catholic

Action in England does not amount to more than the sum of the efforts of each organization taken singly. Intricate staff work at the top has been a devoted but thankless task. Catholic Action (horrible word!) has become mainly an abstract noun describing a certain form of activity. When it does mean a concrete organization it seems to signify little more than a body of officers without an army. What is the reason of this? Have we to give up and stick to our parishes? Is the ideal of a kind of spiritual Ministry of Propaganda co-ordinating all the efforts of our societies a chimæra? Who will be brave enough to write an informed article on this?

THE TEACHING OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

(CLERGY REVIEW, 1941, XXI, pp. 9, 186, 308, 371)

"Peripateticus" writes:

May I offer you the following remarks on the debate begun by "Paedagogus"? It is surely obvious that discussions between professors and students, singly or in small groups, are of great value, and that the more a professor finds it possible to cover the course in this way the better the results will be. Practicability is another question, but if this elementary principle of education were rejected, the outlook would be black. As against Dom Aelred Graham, I do not see that the unique character of Dogmatic Theology is any objection to the more "heuristic" method of exposition proposed by "Paedagogus". The point here (which seems in danger of being obscured) may perhaps be put like this: modern teaching of Dogmatic Theology sometimes fails to assimilate the mind of the student to the truths of the Faith, because he is not sufficiently encouraged to perform the essential processes of thought by which (humanly) they were elaborated. In that sense, but in strict subordination to the end in view, a historical method is required. But what I am chiefly concerned with is the need for an appreciation of speculative difficulties as a means of assimilating the orthodox conclusion, and this leads to a reflection on the function of philosophy in the education of a priest. Dogmatic Theology is not a truly living science until our human scheme of thinking is welded in our minds to those supernatural truths which it is its highest function to explore and by which it must be impregnated. And the methods which "Paedagogus" desiderates are needed first and most urgently in the field of philosophy. We may then hope for an improvement in the legitimate use of human reason in our courses of Theology.

[Further correspondence is held over for lack of space.—EDITOR.]

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM